

FOREIGN AFFAIRS



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS
ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1919-1937

by

E. L. HASLUCK, M.A.



NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND: AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1938

Copyright, 1938, by

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

All rights reserved—no part of this book
may be reproduced in any form without
permission in writing from the publisher,
except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief
passages in connection with a review written
for inclusion in magazine or newspaper

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION. THE VERSAILLES TREATY	ix
CHAPTER I. CENTRAL EUROPE	I
Germany 1; Danzig 37; Austria 37; Hungary 47; Czecho-Slovakia 55	
CHAPTER II. WESTERN EUROPE	60
France 60; Belgium 73; The Netherlands 77; Switzerland 81; Italy 84; Spain 110; Portugal 124	
CHAPTER III. EASTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE	128
Jugoslavia 128; Albania 135; Greece 137; Bulgaria 146; Rumania 151; Poland 158; Russia 166; The Baltic States 197; Lithuania 197; Latvia 200; Estonia 200; Finland 201; Denmark 205; Iceland 206; Norway 207; Sweden 209	
CHAPTER IV. ASIA AND AFRICA	212
Turkey 212; Syria 218; Palestine 220; Arabia 225; Iraq 227; Persia 231; Afghanistan 234; Siam 236; China 236; Japan 251; Egypt, 257; Morocco, 264	
CHAPTER V. AMERICA	267
The United States of America 267; Mexico 294; Central America 301; Cuba 301; Venezuela 302; Brazil 303; Paraguay 305; Uruguay 306; Argentina 306; Chile 309; Bolivia 311; Peru 313; Ecuador 314; Colombia 314	
CHAPTER VI. THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS	316
CHAPTER VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY	335
INDEX	339

PREFACE

The history of the world since the end of the Great War has been so full of movement that any survey within the compass of a single volume must necessarily be a mere outline. The great extension of the means of effecting changes (brought about by the scientific and industrial developments of the last two centuries) has enlarged the scope of governmental activity. In earlier times national and international changes were slow of growth and little affected by the conscious efforts of governing bodies; nowadays a Government that fails, during a year, to undertake at least one important scheme for reorganisation of national conditions is regarded as backward and inefficient. There are very few countries to-day in which social, economic, and political organisation goes on from year to year unchanged. Hence a period of less than twenty recent years contains more material for study and comment than is to be found in whole centuries of earlier history. In a general survey only the most outstanding developments can be dealt with.

After long consideration, it has been thought best to arrange this book on the simple plan of geographical units. There are obvious disadvantages in this method, because it tends to suggest that the affairs of the world are divided into watertight compartments, although in reality the interaction of national efforts and experiments is very large, and many national movements are but expressions of forces and ideas that are affecting all humanity. In a work which dealt with history from the philosopher's point of view, the geographical unit would certainly be discarded, but in a narrative of events intended for an introduction to more detailed and deeper study the advantages of concentrating attention on one political unit at a time outweigh the disadvantages.

The attention devoted to different countries by British readers is bound to vary according to the different degrees of contact with the British Empire. In this survey the proportion of space allotted to different states has been correlated with their significance in the political life of Britons; at the same time, enough information has been included about the countries that are remote from our interest to indicate how public affairs have developed

in those areas. To deal adequately (at least, for British readers) with the post-war history of Great Britain and the Empire would need more space than could be allotted in a single volume on recent world history, and, rather than present an attenuated account of developments that are of more immediate concern to Britons than are those in other countries, it has been decided to confine the scope of this volume to "foreign" affairs.

One who has moved among people of many races and every type of political party finds it difficult to avoid realising the common humanity that underlies all the activities of the national and political groups. Political extremists may consider that I have not given the proper emphasis to the virtues of their friends and the wickednesses of their opponents; but this work has been undertaken as a study of human activity, and not as a polemical diatribe. I must leave it to the propagandists to point the various morals and to add horns and haloes to the leading characters of the political drama.

Changes come about so rapidly nowadays that books dealing with recent history tend to become obsolete within a decade, not only because of fresh developments but because factors that require stressing at one time fade into comparative insignificance within a few years. The books recommended in the Bibliography are selected mainly on account of their special relevance to the situation at the present moment.

E. L. H.

INTRODUCTION

The Versailles Settlement

The end of the Great War was hailed by millions as the beginning of a new age. It was to be a better age in every way, for the sufferings entailed by the four years of intense hostilities were believed to have convinced mankind of the necessity for reforms so extensive as to eradicate war, class-hatred, despotism and poverty. Such phrases as "a new Heaven and a new earth", "the war to end war", "a world safe for democracy", "a land fit for heroes to live in", were heard on thousands of platforms, and for some years afterwards—and even to-day—there is noticeable a tendency to regard "pre-war" and "post-war" as two different civilisations, as clearly defined as those of mediaeval and modern Europe. The disappointment of the hopes of the pacifists and the collapse of parliamentary democracy in so many countries has brought about a reaction from this mood of optimism, and the "post-war mentality" school tends to be swamped to-day by the general feeling that "the old Adam" of individual and collective human nature is ever the same.

The settlement arranged in the peace treaties which followed the war, however, forms a conspicuous epoch in the history of many nations. For some States it meant the starting of a new political life, either under hitherto unknown conditions of national independence or with a community enlarged or restricted by the terms of the treaties. The Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary disappeared from the map. Entirely new states—Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania—appeared on the map. Russia became a federal union of an entirely new type, though not as a result of the treaties. A new type of colonial possession—the "Mandate"—made its appearance. For the first time in history, a permanent international organisation for collective security was established, with an annual parliament, a constitutional council and a regular staff of officials. The material, intellectual and moral condition of the world had been changing continuously for many generations before the war, and the upheaval of the great struggle accelerated the rate of change in

some parts of the world, but it was rather the new political framework than any change in human mentality that made the "Versailles settlement" a turning-point in world history. The most conspicuous change of all—the regeneration of the peoples of the Russian Empire—took place independently of the general peace treaties, but it was the war that gave the occasion for the revolutionary overthrow of the old system in this part of the world.

The settlement of the new map of the world, along with the questions of war penalties and the avoidance of future conflicts, was carried through at a series of discussions held in Paris during the years 1919 and 1920. The results were embodied in five separate treaties, though in popular parlance the first of these treaties—signed in the palace of Versailles in the suburbs of Paris—has given its name to the whole system established by the Paris negotiations, and the history of Europe since 1920 has been in very large measure the working-out of the problems arising from the "Versailles settlement". The treaty with Germany was signed at Versailles in June 1919; that with the Government of the new Austrian Republic followed at St Germain in September, whilst that with Bulgaria was concluded at Neuilly in November. The treaties with the Hungarian Republic and with Turkey were signed at the Trianon—a mansion close to Versailles—and at Sèvres in June and August 1920 respectively.

The Congress of Paris was one of the most remarkable gatherings in history, not only for the number of states represented but for the vast crowd of supernumeraries, officers, agents for minority groups and economic interests, and newspaper correspondents who packed the Parisian hotels to overflowing. Twenty-seven states were represented in the formal conference, with a representation ranging from five each for the Great Powers to one for the smallest nations. The work of discussion was divided among seventeen main committees, with some forty sub-committees. From the outset, as was natural, the Great Powers that had borne the heaviest burden of the war took the lead, and there was little difficulty in getting the crowd of small states to accept the lines of procedure, and also the conclusions, come to by the "Big Five"—France, Great Britain, Italy, the United States and Japan. The "Plenary Session" of all the representatives appointed a "Council of Ten", consisting of two representatives of each of

the Big Five, a Council which reduced its numbers to five—one from each Power—after a few weeks. It is noteworthy that none of the defeated states was allowed even to have a delegate present at the discussion, the terms agreed upon by the Allies being eventually handed to the enemy for acceptance on pain of a renewal of war.

Some of the Governments had ordered a little historical research into the procedure of the last great European peace conference, that of Vienna in 1815, but the lessons that might have been learnt from a study of that period were little utilised, and the Paris proceedings of 1919 took their own line. The problems awaiting solution fell into three main parts—the punishment of the enemy, the new map of the world, and the schemes for collective security through a world parliament. There was more urgency about the first two groups of problems than about the last, whilst the punishment of the enemy was likely to call forth a greater amount of agreement among the Allies than the partition of the spoils. After the fall of the great Napoleon, the Allies wisely separated these three types of problem, first imposing terms on France, then partitioning the ceded territories, and finally forming their Holy Alliance for the maintenance of peace. In 1919 it was decided to consider all three groups of problems together, and to incorporate the decisions on all in one settlement—though eventually there was a division on geographical lines which led to the separate signature of the five treaties with the ex-enemy states—the two new Republics of Austria and Hungary being dealt with separately in spite of their former union in the Dual Monarchy. This lumping together of diverse and divergent questions was due, in the main, to the influence of President Wilson, who insisted on the incorporation of his great scheme for a League of Nations in the separate peace treaties. The result was uniformly bad; it confused the issues, it unduly hurried the consideration of those parts of the settlement that called for protracted discussion, it delayed the more urgent calls for settlement, it nearly split the conference, and, finally, it alienated the very Power whose chief representative had insisted on the procedure for the sake of proposals that proved unpalatable to his people. Alone of the Great Powers—and, in fact, of any of the states except China—the United States refused to sign the Versailles Treaty.

Among the tragic results of this cramming together of all the problems of the peace settlement was the prolongation of the blockade of the enemy states. Though hostilities had ceased, and the disarmament of the enemy had effectively prevented their renewal with any prospect of success to the defeated Powers, the blockade was to be maintained in all its rigour until the enemy accepted the Allies' terms. As a measure of precaution it was useless, since none of the enemy countries was in a position to fight at all; as a measure of punishment it was barbaric, and inflicted most injury on the humble people who were least responsible for the war, and on the children. A measure of alleviation was obtained by the action of the British soldiers of the army of occupation in the Rhineland, who insisted on sharing their rations with the half-starved population of the district and by the bold action of General Plumer, who flatly refused to obey his Government's orders to stop this generosity. In March 1919 a limited importation of food into Germany was permitted, in return for the surrender of the German merchant fleet, and in April the blockade on the allies of Germany was completely raised. There was much point in the comment of the chief German delegate who came to receive the peace terms in May that, when talking about German war crimes, it would be as well to remember the thousands of women and children who had died as the result of the blockade maintained after the disarmament of the defeated nations.

It was particularly galling to the Germans to have to wait for the treaty—in a state of semi-starvation—whilst the Allies delayed the settlement by their own quarrels. There were many occasions when it almost seemed as if the Paris Conference would break up in confusion owing to the divergent views held by the delegates. Marshal Foch had declared that no settlement would give military security to France without an extension of the frontier to the Rhine, and the French claim to the "left bank" was pressed hard by Clemenceau. At the same time France opposed any strengthening of Germany by a possible union of the remnants of Austria with the German Empire. Wilson, who had issued his famous Fourteen Points as the basis of a fair and lasting peace, strove hard to secure the recognition of the principle of self-determination in the new Europe, and at times a deadlock seemed to be reached on the question of the territorial limitation

of Germany. Eventually a compromise was effected: the Germans kept the western Rhineland, but were not allowed to fortify it or to move troops into it, whilst a permanent ban was placed on the union of the Austrian Republic with Germany. A more furious conflict raged over Dalmatia, which had been promised to Italy by France and Britain at the time of the Italian declaration of war against Austria-Hungary. The province was almost entirely Slavonic in population and its inhabitants wanted to be transferred to the new kingdom of Jugoslavia; Wilson backed the demand. France and Britain took Wilson's side on this point, and the Italian delegation packed up and went back to Rome. Eventually Italy agreed to resume her place in the conference, but the atmosphere of the discussions was henceforward hardly conducive to calm consideration of the vast problems of the settlement. Wilson, faced so persistently by the violent claims of the European Allies to aggrandise themselves irrespective of the wishes of local populations, at last lost heart in everything except his League of Nations scheme, and he agreed with many things that he felt were wrong only because he trusted to the clause in the Covenant enabling the League to revise treaties as a means of future redress for the iniquities of the Versailles Treaty. Wilson's doubts and misgivings were not reflected in the public utterances of the British Premier, Lloyd George, who declared in the House of Commons that every clause in the treaty was in accordance with the highest demands of justice and fair play; whilst, incidentally, he promised that the Kaiser should be brought to London for trial.

The penal clauses of the treaties were severe enough. Germany was to cede to the new Polish Republic a large slice of Prussian territory which would leave the eastern extremity of Germany cut off from the rest of the country by the "Polish Corridor". Alsace-Lorraine, taken by the Germans in 1871, went back to France. The great port of Danzig became an independent republic under the supervision of the League of Nations. The Saar mines were to be French property for fifteen years, during which period the district was to be administered by the League. Plebiscites were allowed in Allenstein, Marienwerder and eastern Silesia to decide whether these districts should go to Germany or to Poland; a similar plebiscite was arranged for in the towns of Eupen and Malmédy, which the Belgians claimed. Even neutral Denmark

was to be given a chance of expansion at the expense of Germany, two zones of Schleswig being put at the disposal of the inhabitants by plebiscite. Beyond Europe, the whole of the German colonial empire was wiped out.

Austria and Hungary—now to be separate republics—were reduced to a small fraction of their former extent, Italy, Rumania, Serbia (now become Jugoslavia) and Poland being allotted wide provinces in the former dominions of the Habsburgs, and a new state, Czecho-Slovakia, was carved out of provinces which had previously been Austrian and Hungarian. Bosnia, formerly the joint possession of the Dual Monarchy, went to Jugoslavia. Turkey was to lose all her Asiatic possessions outside Asia Minor, as well as her formal overlordship in Egypt, whilst the Greeks were to take Thrace and a large slice of western Asia Minor. Constantinople was to be placed under the control of an international commission. Of all the allies of Germany, Bulgaria alone escaped without conspicuous loss of pre-war dominions.

In addition to losing territory, the defeated Powers were to pay large war indemnities, though the final figures were left—in the form of a blank cheque—for the Allies to decide on at some future date. As a measure of precaution against a war of revenge, partial disarmament was enforced on the enemy states; conscription was forbidden them, and their armies were restricted to fixed figures, whilst military aircraft, tanks, submarines and other specified armaments were denied them. The western Rhineland was to be demilitarised, and an Allied army of occupation was to remain there for some years after the war. German rivers and waterways were put under the control of an Allied Commission. The union of Germany and Austria was strictly forbidden. Finally, Germany was forced to admit her “war guilt”—the sole responsibility for the war—and to consent to bring to trial a number of selected “war criminals” accused of offences varying from the fomenting of war generally to the perpetration of atrocities on civilians. The list was headed by the ex-Kaiser, who had sought refuge in Holland.

The division of the territorial spoils called into being several states that were new to the map of Europe. Czecho-Slovakia appeared as a huge strip of territory between Germany and Hungary. Out of those Russian provinces that had been occupied by the German army during the war there arose the new states

of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Serbia, after amalgamation with the little kingdom of Montenegro and the annexation of the conquered provinces of Austria-Hungary, became the huge kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes—usually termed Jugoslavia. Rumania doubled her extent and population at the expense of Austria-Hungary. The ancient kingdom of Poland was revived, under republican government, as a huge expanse on the map of eastern Europe. Italy gained parts of Austria and Hungary to the north-east. France regained Alsace-Lorraine. Belgium retained the towns of Eupen and Malmédy, the intended plebiscite never being held. Denmark, as the result of the plebiscites, obtained the northern zone of Schleswig. As to financial indemnities, the division of the reparations payments was left for future settlement between the Allies.

In distributing the colonial possessions of Germany, a new principle was adopted. The ownership of these extensive territories was now vested in the League of Nations, the administration being handed over to various Powers as "mandatories", who had to make an annual report to the League on the progress made by the subject populations and who were accountable to the League for any possible misgovernment. Great Britain received the mandate for German East Africa, part of Togoland, and Nauru Island¹ in the Pacific, whilst the Union of South Africa became the mandatory for German South-west Africa, Australia for Papua and other Pacific islands, and New Zealand for German Samoa. France obtained the mandates for the Cameroons and part of Togoland. Japan became mandatory for the Marshall and Marianne islands in the Pacific, and also for the territory of Kiao-Chow in China. The Turkish territories beyond Asia Minor were to be partly independent—under Arab rule—and partly under the mandates of France and Great Britain.

The remaining part of the peace settlement dealt with provision for future consultation and collaboration between the Governments of the world, and in Wilson's eyes this was the only portion of the treaties that was of permanent importance. The new League of Nations, with its general principles and rules laid down in the treaties as the "Covenant of the League", was to be open for all nations to join, it being the intention to admit

¹ The Nauru mandate was granted to the British Empire, Australia appointing the first Administrator.

the ex-enemy Powers as soon as practicable. The League was to have an annual Assembly, with delegates from all member states, a Council in which the Great Powers would have permanent seats whilst the lesser states would select other members, and a regular secretariat which would be established in permanent offices. The seat of the League was eventually fixed at Geneva.

It was natural that so extensive a settlement as that of Versailles should have been riddled with criticisms from every possible angle. Some of these criticisms arose out of the method adopted for the consideration of the problems; the lumping together of all the settlement proposals, besides delaying those that called for speedy decisions, unduly hurried those which needed mature consideration and long discussion. Much anger was caused at the dictatorial attitude taken up by the Great Powers, especially as displayed by Clemenceau, yet in view of the relative weight of the Powers during the campaigns, it is hard to see how they could have been expected to abandon their control of the situation when the peace terms came up for discussion. It doubtless sounded tyrannical when Clemenceau, in answer to the protest of the Rumanian representative, said, "M. Bratianu, you are here to listen, not to discuss", but it must be remembered that the smaller Allies were all urging extravagant and often mutually conflicting claims to territorial aggrandisement. The ignorance of the leading statesmen has come in for much ridicule; they were guilty of such geographical "howlers" as the confusion of Silesia with Cilicia, and the belief that the surrender of Kharkov to the Bolsheviks referred to the capture of a Russian general. Yet these statesmen were the supreme products of contemporary democracy, and their shortcomings must be laid at the door rather of the electorates and parliaments that put them into their lofty positions.

The main criticisms, however, have been directed against the vindictive character of the settlement. Here two points of view are in conflict. On the one hand we have the feeling that aggressive warfare should be punished by severe measures, as a warning to those who at some future date may feel tempted to resort to arms to achieve their ambitions: since the Allied peoples were convinced that it was the enemy who had started the war, this penal deterrent idea had a wide circle of supporters. On the other hand was the desire to begin a new era of human co-operation

and peace with a settlement which carefully considered the feelings and claims of every section of the political world, irrespective of whether it had fought on the one side or on the other. The peace negotiations of Paris were unique in the history of the Great Powers inasmuch as the defeated states were not even represented at the conferences until the Allies' terms were handed to them to accept or reject, rejection being inevitably punished by military invasion and conquest. From a "common-sense" point of view, apart from idealist considerations, it appeared advisable to avoid as far as possible the appearance of injustice, for national wrongs, real or imagined, have a way of rankling for decades. The French people, who now declared that the Germans were wholly responsible for drawing the sword, had for a generation been talking of "la revanche"—the revenge for the unjust seizure of Alsace-Lorraine. The Versailles settlement left a whole crop of Alsace-Lorraines all over the world.

CHAPTER I

Central Europe

GERMANY

On 10 November 1918 a mass meeting called by the newly formed "Workers' Councils" of Berlin to assemble in the great hall of the Busch Circus elected the first Government of the German Republic. Within a few days Germany seemed to be transformed. For four years there had been a steady succession of German military triumphs, the fulfilment of that dream of expansion and supremacy which had been summed up in the idea of "Der Tag". Belgium conquered—eastern France overrun—the Russian "steam-roller" hurled back with catastrophic losses—Poland conquered—Russia forced into a peace dictated by Berlin—Bulgaria and Turkey saved—Roumania conquered—Serbia conquered—Italy invaded—such were the main results of the Great War at the beginning of the year 1918. Even the addition of the United States of America to her enemies seemed to have little effect in stemming the tide of Germany's victorious progress; in the spring of 1918 the Allied trench-line in the west was smashed through and the German armies were heading for Paris and Calais. In the summer the German progress was checked. By the beginning of autumn a "strategic retreat" was announced, Germany giving up some small part of her huge conquests. Then, in a few weeks, came the débâcle.

One after the other Germany's allies threw in their hands—Bulgaria, Turkey and Austria all hoisted the white flag. Like Napoleon in 1814, Ludendorff prepared to rally his armies for another great struggle—for the defence of the Fatherland. Then the long-sustained effort of the German people suddenly collapsed. The outbreak started at Kiel, where the sailors of the fleet that claimed to have won the battle of Jutland rose against the Kaiser and the perpetuation of the war. Mobs rose in other towns, first in northern Germany, then in the south. The Kiel sailors entrained for the capital, and on their arrival Berlin joined in the revolution. The movement was as universal as it was sudden. No die-hard minority attempted to shoot down the

rebels or even tried to pull down the red flags that appeared in scores of German towns. The High Command resigned; the Kaiser abdicated and fled to Holland. The new army commanders accepted an armistice dictated by Marshal Foch; guns, tanks, aeroplanes and warships were handed over to the Allies, and the soldiers streamed off homewards. The Great War was over.

It is often forgotten that the German Republic was founded under extremely abnormal conditions. Not only had Germany lost the war, but the people were in a state of semi-starvation. The gradually tightened blockade deprived the mass of the population of essential foodstuffs, and the physical deterioration of the civilian population induced a condition of inertia and despair in adversity that put the nation at the mercy of any vigorous political group that cared to strike hard. Apart from the fact that the pressure of the Allies would forbid the retention of the old Hohenzollern Government, almost any development might have taken place in German politics. It must be remembered, too, that the blockade was maintained right through the peace negotiations until the agreement negotiated in April, 1919. This severe punishment left behind bitter resentment among the victims, for Germany was disarmed and no longer able to resist the Allies. On the other hand it could be argued that the Allied countries were also short of food, though to a much lesser extent, and that until world supplies became more plentiful it was not altogether unfair that the available stocks should go to the Allies, who believed that the war was entirely the fault of the Germans. It was also argued that the bait of free imports could be usefully reserved to induce Germany to accept the terms of the victors without delay.

Conservative opinion in Germany has never accepted the thesis that the German army was beaten by the Allies. It is true that there was no spectacular round-up of beaten armies and that the reserve defence-line of the Rhine was not broken by assault, since surrender came before the Allies reached it; yet when the armistice came the German armies were in full retreat from territories that they had proudly held for four years, and the depletion of man-power had become so severe on the German side that it is extremely difficult to imagine a successful resistance against forces that were only just beginning to tap the reserves provided by American armies. The revolution, which was more

a protest against the continuance of the war than a democratic movement, originated with the navy and the civilian population, but the army made no effort to suppress it. Professor Hodgkin observes in his account of the legend of Vortigern and Hengist, that "We were betrayed!" is the cry of every defeated cause.

Public opinion in the Germany of the armistice period was mainly of a negative kind; most people wanted peace before all things. Politically minded folk of Radical and Socialist tendencies naturally wished to take the opportunity of extending democracy and workers' control; the old army caste remained intensely conservative, regretting the monarchy and despising the Socialists as defeatists and traitors to Germania. The emphasis that had been laid by responsible leaders of the Allies on the distinction between the wicked Kaiser and the deluded German masses, together with the conspicuous fairness of the spirit of the famous Fourteen Points of President Wilson, prompted many Germans to favour a strongly democratic, if not a Socialist form of government, and the "Council of People's Representatives" set up at the Busch Circus meeting, consisting as it did of six parliamentary Socialists, commanded the support of a majority of the nation. Three of them were Minority Socialists, who had throughout opposed the war; the other three were Majority Socialists, who by balancing the more extreme wing of the new Ministry reassured moderate opinion. The majority parties of the Reichstag were passed over, not so much because they were not Socialist as because they would have less chance of successfully appealing to the generosity of the Allies at the coming peace conference.

It was natural that extremists should attempt to strike out on their own lines. In numerous towns and villages, and even among the regiments of the army, "Soviets" of the Russian type appeared; there was little Communism about these Soviets and still less demand for violent measures. There was a revolutionary group among the Independent Socialists, known as the *Obleute*—the "chiefs"—who had plotted a rising in Berlin before the Kaiser's fall, but whose revolution was forestalled by that of the Kiel sailors: this party was strong among the shop stewards in the heavy industries. The "Spartacus Union", openly Communist, wanted to link up the new Soviets and carry through a social revolution, though there was much disunion in the little party, its most famous members, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa

Luxembourg, being far more moderate in opinions than the majority of the group. The reactionaries thought it best to confine their attention to watching these extremist groups of the Left, and one of the first moves of the Provisional Government was to instal a private telephone line between the Government headquarters and the Berlin officers' quarters. The new Government was determined to maintain order, even at the expense of using the Kaiser's old friends to enforce it.

The definitive settlement of the German Constitution was to be left to a freely elected national assembly, for which the Government extended the franchise to all Germans of both sexes from the age of twenty. As regards immediate domestic policy, the new Government contented itself with a host of Socialist decrees recognising the principles of the eight-hour day, improved labour conditions, unemployment relief, compulsory wage agreements, and similar reforms. It set up a Commission to explore the possibilities of a nationalisation of industry. Otherwise it was content to mark time until the new Parliament should meet. In foreign policy all it could do was to await the terms of the Allied diplomats and statesmen who were assembling at Paris. Locally, all kinds of changes were introduced by the State Governments. All the old dynasties were deposed; the eight little Thuringian states agreed to combine into a single state; new Ministries were set up. All the State Governments were predominantly Majority Socialist except that of Bavaria, where Kurt Eisner, a Minority Socialist, came into power.

The extremists were not long in stirring up trouble. Within a month of the armistice Conservative army officers seized the local Soviet offices and their troops opened fire on a Spartacist procession, sixteen people being killed. A "Congress of Soviets" in Berlin claimed the right to dismiss the Provisional Government. The Kiel sailors, impatient over arrears of pay, stormed the offices of the Cabinet, which promptly telephoned for the troops. After some desultory skirmishing, the sailors got their money and went home. This affair led to the resignation of the Minority Socialists from the Government; on the recommendation of the "Congress of Soviets" their places were filled by three new men. During the Christmas holidays there was a fight between two groups of Socialists at a Berlin newspaper office. Then, in the new year, the Spartacists seized several newspaper offices; Noske, one

of the new members of the Provisional Government, called in the army officers to suppress the Spartacists, and after a hurried whip-round for volunteers to form "Free Corps" to assert the supremacy of the Government, a regular battle started in the streets of Berlin. Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg advised the Spartacists to disperse, but without effect; once the fighting had developed, however, the leaders refused to abandon their party and stayed with the rebels. Several days of skirmishing ended with the dispersal of the Spartacists by Noske's Free Corps. A few days later Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were caught by the Government troops and lynched. The leading perpetrators of these murders were afterwards court-martialled and convicted, but they escaped from prison, probably with the connivance of the military authorities.

Berlin was not the only place where disturbances took place. During the early part of 1919 there were disorders at Hamburg, Bremen, Leipzig and other large towns. Noske, who had made himself responsible for the maintenance of order, sent his Free Corps to these provincial centres of unrest with telling effect, and proved himself to be as resolute and severe an enemy of the extreme Left as any Kaiserist could have been. A section of the Berlin workmen proclaimed a general strike as a protest against his alliance with the Conservative army officers, and the extremists improved upon the occasion to attempt another revolution. Noske troopers, however, again restored order, and a series of executions followed. Meanwhile Bavaria was up in arms. In February 1919 a Conservative assassin murdered Kurt Eisner, the Socialist Prime Minister of Bavaria; in revenge for this, a Socialist entered the Bavarian parliament-house and shot a member who had been one of Eisner's political enemies. These events were followed by a whole series of riots and murders, which culminated in the proclamation in Munich of a Soviet Republic in April. The Bavarian Government, now led by a Majority Socialist named Hoffmann, fled to Bamberg, and the Communists occupied Augsburg and Würzburg. The business was ended by the appearance of Noske's ubiquitous Free Corps hurrying from Berlin, and the Soviet Republic of Bavaria went down in an orgy of butcheries, in which both sides showed themselves equally savage.

It was in circumstances such as these that the National Assembly held its deliberations on the new German Constitution. Partly

because Berlin was associated with Kaiserdom and the hegemony of Prussia, but mainly because the capital was in so turbulent a condition, this Assembly was summoned to meet at Weimar in Thuringia. The elections were well attended, 95 per cent of the electorate registering their votes. Against the advice of Liebknecht, the Spartacists had decided to boycott the elections, relying on a seizure of power by force. The returns showed, on the basis of proportional representation, only 21 extreme leftists, under the name of Independent Socialists, out of a house of 421. The moderate Socialist party returned 163 members, the Catholic party—known as the “Centre”—88, the Democrats—a Radical party—75, the “Nationalists”—the German Conservatives—42, and the “People’s Party”—the German Liberals—21, while a dozen independents completed the house. The Socialist Ebert, who had taken the lead in the Provisional Government, was accepted by the Assembly as Provisional President of the German Republic, a post that was confirmed to him by popular vote under the new Constitution a few months later. The new Government was a coalition of Socialists, Catholics and Radicals, Scheidemann, a member of the retiring Provisional Government, becoming Chancellor—or Prime Minister. The Ministry, however, was almost entirely Socialist, for a Government that had the least connections with the Reichstag majority of 1914 would have a slightly better chance of consideration at the hands of the Allies at Paris.

The Constitution drawn up at Weimar maintained the principle of universal suffrage for both sexes at the age of twenty, a Reichstag being elected by the system of proportional representation. The federal principle of the old Reich was maintained, and seats were allotted in the second chamber—the Reichsrat—according to the importance of the eighteen constituent states, the members being nominated by their respective State Governments. A President was to be elected by popular vote every seven years. Provision was made for the use of both the referendum and the initiative. The two leading principles of the Constitution were democracy and federalism. In view of the prospective union of the German-speaking Austrians to the German Reich, provision was made for the allotment of seats to German Austria, but this provision had to be expunged owing to the opposition of the Allies to the increase of German territory.

The Assembly also adopted a new national flag, or rather reverted to the old democratic standard of the rebels of 1848, with its black, red and gold. It was a gesture to the Allies as indicating a break with the past, but it had no effect on modifying their attitude of severity. The terms of Versailles were harsh, and the Scheidemann Government was unable to bring itself to sign them. It therefore resigned, and a new Ministry headed by Bauer signed the treaty which deprived Germany of Alsace-Lorraine, West Prussia, Eastern Silesia, North Schleswig, and the whole of her colonial empire. Helpless as Germany was from a military point of view, over a hundred members of the Assembly voted against its acceptance. Apart from building the Constitution and accepting the peace treaty, the Weimar Assembly did little; it appointed a couple of Economic Councils to investigate the coal and potash industries, and it sanctioned a capital levy to raise funds; social reforms were left to the new Parliament which was to be elected under the rules of the Constitution.

Before the first elections could be held under the new Constitution the violent parties caused more trouble. In January 1920 the Independent Socialists, holding a mass meeting outside the Reichstag building, came into conflict with the police, and the affair ended with machine-gun fire and the death of forty-two persons. A week or so later a Conservative fanatic tried to assassinate Erzberger, the Catholic leader, who was a member of the Cabinet. In March, the army men, led by Dr Wolfgang Kapp, a Prussian official, made the famous "putsch" or assault on Berlin. Kapp entered the capital at the head of regiments that had been fighting Bolsheviks in Latvia and proclaimed himself Chancellor. The Government, taken by surprise, fled to Dresden, and the Assembly was adjourned from Weimar to Stuttgart. The democratic elements in Berlin, however, mastered the rebels without Government help. The Trade Unions proclaimed a general strike against the Kapp regime; the city was left without light, power or transport. The Government accepted this policy and proclaimed the general strike in all areas that should support the rebels. After four days in a hostile city the Kapp party retired from Berlin, followed by a hooting mob that the rebels savagely fired on as they departed. Kapp fled to Sweden; his supporters in a few other towns were easily suppressed after some fighting. No sooner had the extreme Conservative movement been

crushed when the Communists raised their heads again. The Communist Daunig was proclaimed Chancellor in Berlin, and several other towns rose under the red flag. This rising was also soon suppressed by the regular troops.

In restoring order, the Government happened to provoke an unpleasant incident with the Allies. A party of Communists had seized Essen and Wesel in the neutralised zone; the German Government asked permission of the Allies to cross the military frontier to suppress this movement. Without waiting for consent to be given, German troops entered the neutral zone. A French force immediately marched eastwards, occupying Frankfort, Darmstadt and Homburg. In Frankfort there was a riot on the arrival of the French, and several Germans were shot down by the troops. Eventually the whole matter was explained and the two armies withdrew, but the incident left very bitter feelings behind it.

At last, in June 1920, the first general election under the Weimar Constitution was held. Under the system of proportional representation, the Socialists returned as the largest party, obtaining 110 seats, whilst the Independent Socialists secured 80. The Catholic *Centre* Party obtained 88 seats, the Conservatives 65, the Liberals 60 and the Radicals 45. Two Spartacists were returned. After the Kapp *putsch* Bauer had resigned the premiership in favour of another Socialist, Hermann Müller. The general feeling of the new Parliament was hostile to Socialism, and the Government that took office after the elections of 1920 was composed of Catholics, Liberals and Radicals, with the Catholic Fehrenbach as Premier.

The dominant factor in the situation when the new Government settled down to begin the reconstruction of Germany was the vast millstone of reparations which was being prepared for the neck of the beaten nation. The Versailles Treaty had bound Germany to pay an unspecified amount which was to be settled later, and it took many months of long argument for the Allies to agree on the sum that was to be extracted. The general principle adopted was that Germany, having both caused the war and started it, must pay for all the damage done by the war in the Allied countries, including the pensions incurred as the result of war casualties. Four years of war, however, had proved so enormously destructive that for a nation the size of the new

Germany to meet the bill the payments would have to be spread out over generations. The British Treasury, calculating, not what Germany ought morally to pay or what the Allies needed to replace their losses, but what the German people could raise within the next generation, estimated the maximum obtainable—reckoned in English money—as £2,000,000,000. The final figure, however, fixed by the Allies after a twelvemonth of discussion came to more than three times this amount—the grand total being £6,600,000,000. The shares of the various Allies were also settled, France, which had suffered most, getting half the total amount received. The German Government flatly refused to listen to such proposals, and the Allies decided to apply military pressure. An Allied force advanced to Düsseldorf in April 1921, and also occupied Duisburg and Ruhrort. Germany was helpless to resist. In May the German representatives signed an agreement to shoulder this immense burden, and it was agreed that every year an instalment of £100,000,000 should be handed over, whilst in addition to this the proceeds of a tax of 25 per cent on the value of all German exports should go to the Reparations fund. It seemed likely that the full amount would not be raised before the expiration of fifty years—a terrible punishment for a nation whose rulers of the war period would all be dead long before the penalty was paid in full.

The German Government paid an instalment on the first year's debt in the following August, but before the end of the year declared that at present the burden was too great. A moratorium was requested, and the Allies granted it. As the year 1922 passed without any attempt of the Germans to collect any portion of the next instalment, France, as the chief creditor, proposed to enforce payment, if necessary by a renewed invasion. Here, however, the Allies split. The British Government of Lloyd George was beginning to relax its severe attitude towards Germany, and even after Lloyd George had given place to Bonar Law, the British attitude was opposed to military action. Bonar Law, in fact, proposed not only to give Germany four more years of moratorium but to reduce the total burden to £1,250,000,000—less than a fifth of the original figure.

Such a proposal simply outraged the feelings of the French, who, under the premiership of Raymond Poincaré, resolved to act alone, as the Treaty of Versailles allowed them to do. The

Reparations Commission—the inter-Allied body that was supervising the payments—declared Germany a wilful defaulter, the British delegate dissenting, and an “economic mission” was despatched into the Ruhr valley. This “economic mission” took the shape of a French army, to which a detachment of Belgian troops and some Italian engineers were attached; the most important industrial area in Germany was seized by French officials, who took financial control of the mines and factories in Essen, Dortmund, Duisburg, and the surrounding industrial centres. Local officials who tried to obstruct the invaders were expelled from the district; rioters and demonstrators were sent to jail. In a riot at Krupp’s works thirteen persons were killed. The German Government, unable to resist by force, tried to stultify the French action by passive resistance. The German industrial workers went on strike, and were supported *en masse* by copious grants of relief from Berlin. The money was obtained, however, mainly by inflating the currency; huge quantities of paper money were printed and sent into the Ruhr valley. The value of the mark, which had already declined from its pre-war value of 1s. to less than a penny, shrank to a fraction of a farthing, and then to a negligible quantity.

The French, though unable to make much progress with the exploitation of the wealth of the Ruhr valley, did not show any signs of weakening, in spite of constant urgings from Great Britain. They caused still more trouble to Germany by fomenting a separatist movement in the Rhineland, and in October an independent Rhenish Republic was proclaimed by a group of Germans in Aachen. The people of the Rhineland however, were overwhelmingly against this movement which was led by men of little standing and still less reputation. The separatists managed to seize the city of Speier, but in the new year German troops expelled them and shot most of the rebels down without mercy.

The utter collapse of the financial situation in Germany, owing to the flood of paper money, at last convinced the German Government that it could no longer support the passive resistance movement. In September the relief was suspended and strikers in the Ruhr were advised to return to work. The Ruhr invasion appeared to have succeeded, and stocks of coal and manufactured goods began to accumulate in French hands. But the financial

collapse of Germany made it even more difficult than before for her to pay reparations, whilst the material gains of the occupation of the industrial centres of the Ruhr were offset by the expenses of the expedition. The increased taxation in France necessitated by the adventure provoked a reaction, and in the elections of 1924 Poincaré was heavily defeated. The nation showed no particular inclination to reverse its policy towards Germany, but the new Premier, Herriot, was less militant in ideas than Poincaré, and he accepted a proposal to reopen the whole question of the amount and method of payment of reparations.

There followed the establishment of a committee of economic experts under the chairmanship of General Dawes, an American banker. The "Dawes Plan" recommended by this international committee made no reduction in the total due from Germany, and actually increased the annual payments from £100,000,000 to £125,000,000, but this latter figure was to include the former separate payment from the export duties. There was also a guarantee of a reduction in the event of a general fall in price levels. But the novel feature of the Dawes Plan was the granting to Germany of loans from the Allies to enable these heavy annual payments to be made. As a temporary concession the payments due in the first three years were to be reduced, the amount increasing until in the fourth year it reached the normal figure of £125,000,000. Germany accepted these proposals, and France, satisfied that she had scotched an attempt to evade payment altogether, also agreed. The Dawes Plan was at once put into operation, under the supervision of a special Allied agent in Berlin, the American Parker Gilbert. The French army was then withdrawn from the Ruhr.

In 1923 Gustavus Stresemann became Chancellor of Germany, and, though he resigned the premiership after a few months, he retained, as Foreign Minister, the dominant influence in the German Government. Stresemann urged what was called the "policy of fulfilment"; Germany was to work her way back to a strong position in the world by scrupulously fulfilling her treaty engagements, burdensome as they were. The reparation payments dictated by the Dawes Plan were paid regularly and in full for the next five years, though to enable this to be accomplished Germany borrowed from abroad close on £1,000,000,000. Stresemann, by honouring these obligations and by accepting

the Rhine frontier in the Treaty of Locarno of 1925, won the confidence of the Allies to such an extent that in 1928 they agreed, on the advice of Parker Gilbert, to reopen the whole question of reparations, mainly with a view to reducing the grand total of payments. There followed a Commission under the chairmanship of another American banker, Owen Young, which—after rather stormy arguments—eventually propounded a plan under which the grand total was reduced from £6,600,000,000 to £5,000,000,000, which was to be spread over a period of fifty-nine years. The Young Plan also abolished the inter-Allied Reparations Commission, the special agent at Berlin, and the rights of supervision of German finances guaranteed to these organs by the Dawes Plan. The management of the new payments was to be entrusted to a new international institution of an economic and not a political nature—the Bank for International Settlements, which was established at Basle.

The great speculation mania that swept over the United States in 1929 resulted in the calling in of money falling due from expiring foreign loans, and a good deal of the money borrowed by Germany under the Dawes Plan was on short term. The sudden call for the repayment of these short-term loans in addition to the annual instalment of the reparations payment proved too much for Germany, and she appealed for another moratorium. As the great economic crisis was soon sweeping over the world, on President Hoover's suggestion the Allies agreed to a general suspension of war payments, both for reparations and for inter-Allied debts, and in 1931 a moratorium for a year was arranged. When this respite was about to expire, a conference was called at Lausanne to discuss the situation. The Lausanne Conference of 1932 took a momentous step. It agreed to make the general conditions of the Hoover moratorium permanent, that is to say, if all the Allies would cancel the war debts they owed to each other, reparations would also be cancelled. This would leave Germany saddled with only the repayment of the loans raised under the Dawes Plan and the interest on them. The carrying into effect of the Lausanne proposals hinged on the willingness of the United States, the most important creditor country, to accept it, all the other interested parties having intimated their approval of the scheme. America, however, refused to abandon her claims to repayment of war loans to the Allies, and the scheme was

brought to a deadlock. Bitter disputes over the American attitude now diverted the Allies' attention away from Germany, and by tacit agreement the Hoover moratorium was continued indefinitely. No attempt was made to secure a resumption of payments by Germany, and the European Allies withheld their own payments that were due to America and to each other. The whole of the arrangements for the paying off of war obligations dissolved in chaos. Thus did Germany become free from the great burden of reparations.

In addition to reparations, there were several important matters arising from the Versailles Treaty to be settled. There were the various plebiscites in the outlying areas. Allenstein and Marienwerder voted for Germany as against Poland. South Schleswig went German and North Schleswig Danish. Eupen and Malmédy were denied a plebiscite of the understood type; opponents of union with Belgium were allowed the right of petition against it, over open signatures. Less than three hundred ventured to do so. The Silesian plebiscite was more complicated, for the territory was to be divided according to the proportion of voters for Germany and Poland. About 700,000 voted German and about 480,000 voted Polish, but the distribution of the majorities among the towns and villages was so intricately mixed that no clear line could be drawn across the plebiscite area to separate the two peoples. Whilst the League of Nations was discussing the problem the Poles took up arms under Korfanty and tried to seize the whole district. British and Italian troops restored order, and the League then dictated a settlement which, though giving Germany two-thirds of the area, left Poland with all the iron mines and three-quarters of the coal and zinc mines. The three strongly German towns of Kattowitz, Tarnowitz and Königshütte were all left on the Polish side of the new boundary. There was to be no plebiscite in the Saar for fifteen years, the territory being in the meanwhile administered by a League of Nations Commission for the economic benefit of France; French control of the mines and steelworks was profoundly unpopular, and in 1922 the inhabitants petitioned the League to interfere against the abuses of the administration; no serious action was, however, taken.

Under the Versailles Treaty Germany had pledged herself to bring to trial a number of "war criminals" who were marked out by the Allies as guilty of atrocities and other irregularities of

conduct during the campaigns. A court was set up at Leipzig, and a long-drawn-out series of trials began. A few notorious individuals were sent to prison, and other persons were acquitted. After a while all interest in the Leipzig court evaporated, and the trials were suspended, never to be resumed.

The United States and China had not signed the Versailles Treaty, the former owing to popular opposition to the idea of the League of Nations, the latter owing to the cession of Kiao-Chow to Japan. Separate peace treaties between these states and Germany were negotiated—with America in 1921 and with China in 1922.

Under the peace treaty Allied armies were to occupy the territory on the western side of the Rhine until satisfaction was given that Germany was carrying out the terms of the settlement, including the payment of reparations. The failure of Germany to meet her reparations commitments led to a prolongation of this occupation. In pursuance of his "policy of fulfilment" Stresemann in 1925 agreed to the Treaty of Locarno, under which Germany recognised the permanence of the Versailles frontiers in the west and approved the obligation imposed on Great Britain and Italy of taking military action against whichever of the two Powers, France or Germany, violated that frontier. This friendly attitude on the part of the German Government, as expressed in the acceptance of the Dawes Plan in 1924 and the Locarno Treaty of 1925, secured the evacuation of half the occupied area, the Allied troops leaving the northern Rhineland at the beginning of 1926. The southern section remained in military occupation until 1930, when—as a result of Germany's acquiescence in the Young Plan of 1929—the last of the foreign troops were withdrawn.

The Fehrenbach Ministry which took office after the elections of 1920 resigned owing to its failure to prevent the enforcement of the heavy reparations payments decided upon by the Allies. Wirth, another Catholic member, took office as Chancellor, with a coalition Ministry composed of Catholics, Socialists and Radicals. Reparations also wrecked this Ministry, for when France was threatening to invade the Ruhr, the Wirth Cabinet lost support through its unwillingness to provoke France to extremes, and at the end of 1922 a so-called "non-political" Government was established under the Chancellorship of Cuno, managing

director of the Hamburg-America line. Such political Ministers as held office in this Cabinet were of Liberal and Catholic opinions, along with one Radical. The Cuno Government was distinguished for two things—its support of “passive resistance” in the Ruhr, and its catastrophic inflation of the currency. The floods of paper money became so overwhelming that sums of money which in pre-war days were worth £1,000,000,000, and which a year before had represented £40,000,000, were now worth the equivalent of an English penny. The social and economic effects of this deluge were enormous. All those whose fortunes consisted of investments were utterly ruined, since their money was reckoned at the value of the depreciated currency. On the other hand landowners and the proprietors of businesses benefited by being able to pay off mortgages and debts of enormous size at the price of a box of matches. The German Socialists have always believed that the inflation was deliberately devised for this very purpose, to serve the interests of “big business”, which thus got rid of its own debts, and that the Ruhr relief was merely a blind for this ingenious and Machiavellian scheme. The chaos of wages and prices under the depreciated currency, when alterations were made daily, led to acute distress among the poorer classes, and before long strikes and disorders broke out. Following on a general strike in Berlin to demand the resignation of the Government, the Cuno Ministry fell, and a new coalition of Liberals, Socialists, Catholics and Radicals took office under Stresemann.

As in the days of 1919 and 1920 the Government was now threatened by two extreme parties. In Saxony and Thuringia left-wing Socialists and Communists gained a majority in the local parliaments and set up left-wing administrations; in Bavaria, on the other hand, the Conservatives established a local dictatorship under von Kahr, a former State Premier. A Conservative rebellion broke out among troops at Küstrin, and in Bavaria Kahr was refusing to recognise the control of Berlin over the Bavarian regiments and organising a march on the capital. The Stresemann Government acted with energy. The Küstrin rising was put down by force; troops were moved into Saxony and Thuringia, and the Socialist-Communist Governments in those states were deposed, though they had not so far taken any rebellious action; a firm attitude was adopted towards Bavaria and preparations

were made to enforce the subjection of that state to central control. Kahr hesitated; his plans for a march on Berlin were practically complete, but the suppression of the left-wing Governments in Thuringia and Saxony had led to the resignation of the Socialists from the Berlin Cabinet, and weakened the democratic character of the Government. After negotiations with Berlin, Kahr called the rising off and submitted on the question of the Bavarian regiments. A few Bavarian Conservatives and their allies under Adolf Hitler rose in rebellion in November, intending to pursue the march to Berlin, but Kahr gave them no support and they were quickly dispersed, Hitler being sentenced to imprisonment. In Berlin the Government was reconstructed as a coalition of Liberals and Catholics, under the Catholic Wilhelm Marx, Stresemann remaining as Foreign Minister; a few months later the Conservative party—the Nationalists—joined the coalition, and Conservative Ministers took office for the first time since the Weimar Constitution had been in existence.

Under the Marx-Stresemann Government Germany obtained a new and stable currency. After an interim period during which paper money was issued on the security of the value of landed property in the country—the *Rentenmark*—the *Reichsmark*, based on the gold standard, appeared in 1924. The general election of May 1924 made little difference to the distribution of parties, and when the Marx Government appealed to the electorate again on the Dawes Plan in December a good majority for the “policy of fulfilment” was returned. The Cabinet was now reconstructed, with Dr Luther as Chancellor and Stresemann still at the Foreign Office. In 1926 Luther handed the Chancellorship back to Marx. Throughout this period the dominant personality in the Cabinet was that of Stresemann, who carried through both the Dawes Plan and the Locarno Treaty, and secured the entry of Germany into the League of Nations in 1925. Locarno temporarily alienated the Conservatives, who resigned from the coalition at the end of 1925, though they returned at the beginning of 1927.

The death of President Ebert was followed by an election which saw the appearance of seven candidates. Dr Jarres had the support of the Liberals and the Conservatives, Braun, the Socialist Premier of Prussia, Marx, the Catholic Premier, and General Ludendorff—the nominee of Hitler’s Nazi group—also stood, and there were in addition Communist, Radical and Bavarian Catholic candi-

dates. Jarres headed the poll with over ten million votes; Braun came second with eight million, and Marx scored four million. None of the other candidates reached 10 per cent of the votes cast, the Nazi candidate coming last with some 300,000 votes. Under the Constitution a second ballot had to be held to secure an absolute majority. The Socialists, although second in the poll, felt that they could not hope to win on the second ballot, and resolved to support Marx. Then, to the general surprise, Dr Jarres withdrew in favour of a new candidate, the Conservative General Hindenburg, hero of the Great War and now aged seventy-seven, who somewhat unwillingly accepted the nomination. Of the smaller parties only the Communists went on to the second ballot. The result was a victory for Hindenburg, who obtained 48 per cent of the votes as against Marx's 45 per cent. The Communist Thälmann polled two million.

The general election of 1928 increased the Socialist and Communist votes and reduced the Conservative vote. Stresemann was now able to arrange a coalition in which the Socialists, Catholics, Liberals and Radicals combined, with the Conservatives, Communists, and smaller groups in opposition. Hermann Muller, the Socialist, became Prime Minister once more. This Cabinet's main work was the negotiation of the Young Plan. The Conservatives and the Nazis strongly opposed the continuance of the huge indemnity payments and tried to secure a referendum on their proposed repudiation of the Versailles Treaty; the preliminary initiative poll, however, failed to secure the necessary number of votes, only six million out of the eleven million required being forthcoming. In October 1929 Stresemann died from an apoplectic stroke.

Beneath the surface of the calm parliamentarian group-government which marked the six years when Stresemann was the dominant statesman of the Cabinet, there were symptoms of unrest and violence that augured ill for the future. Violent methods had never departed from the politics of the extremist groups in Germany. In 1921 two well-known statesmen were assassinated, first Erzberger, a Catholic, who had taken part in the Versailles surrender, and then Walter Rathenau, a Jewish Radical. Erzberger had already been shot at and wounded in 1920, and early in 1921 a Socialist member of Parliament, Gareis, was murdered. Though the later victims were not so distinguished, nearly every year

there were several political murders, mainly at the hands of militarist extremists; these crimes were known as *Vehm* murders, from the mediaeval Social Courts which sentenced troublesome characters to death by the law known as the *Vehmgericht*. In 1928 there was an outbreak of bomb-throwing in German Schleswig, and in the following year the Communists broke out into numerous riots in which the casualties exceeded two hundred.

Even more disquieting than these isolated outbursts of terrorism was the slow building-up of military organisations outside the control of the Government. Germany was limited by the Versailles Treaty to an army of 100,000; this *Reichswehr* was, however, supplemented by so-called Labour Corps, and throughout the ranks the old military tradition was dominant. Through several changes of Government the War Minister remained the same, Gessler being the nominee of the *Reichswehr* itself. After eight years, Gessler got mixed up in a scandal about an unauthorised cinema company, the profits of which were intended to build up a fund for the leaders of the *Reichswehr* to use in political directions. The company failed, and in the subsequent inquiry, Gessler was forced to resign, in 1928. His place was, however, taken, on the advice of President Hindenburg, by General Gröner, who during the war had been Hindenburg's chief of staff.

There were also the *Stahlhelm*—the "Steel Helmet"—the old officers' association, and numerous volunteer Free Corps which masqueraded as gymnastic societies, but which devoted their main attention to preparing for a "Day" when the army would give Germany a strong Government freed from the domination of the Allies. In 1924 the Socialist party produced its own military organisation—the *Reichsbanner*. There was also a marked development of anti-Semitism, resulting in the formation of clubs and societies that advocated "Pure German racialism". The active society of National Socialists, usually known as Nazis, became conspicuous in a number of Jew-baiting affairs. During 1929 the *Stahlhelm* was dissolved in the western provinces of Prussia, owing to its violent activities, but the general state of volcanic agitation was not modified. Meanwhile, after a period of comparatively good trade following the Stresemann agreements with the Allies, unemployment began to increase. After the American withdrawal of loans in 1929 and 1930 unemploy-

ment in Germany mounted to a figure of nearly five millions. It only needed the great economic crisis of 1931 to let loose all the forces that were plotting revolution of one kind or another in Germany.

The early weeks of the crisis in Germany brought about a serious situation in the German Treasury, and the Müller Government applied to the banks for help in the way of loans. The banks, extremely doubtful of the Socialist policy of spending money in large quantities on social service developments, refused, through the representations of Dr Schacht, Director of the *Reichsbank*, to offer help to a Government in which the finance department was controlled by a Socialist. This led to the resignation of Muller and his Socialists, and a new Government was formed under a Catholic Premier, Brüning, supported by the Conservative, Liberal and Catholic groups. As in so many European countries, the Government now demanded emergency powers to deal with the difficulties of the crisis. Under Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution emergency decrees were recognised, provided that Parliament gave its previous consent to the increase of the powers of the Government. The power had been used in 1923 for a short time and under strict limitations, and when Brüning proposed the adoption of similar measures it was not by any means evident that the step would lead to a dictatorship. The Socialists, now excluded from the Ministry, opposed the grant of emergency powers, and the Reichstag rejected the proposals of Brüning by a majority of eleven. Brüning now obtained the President's consent to a dissolution of Parliament, and during the elections that followed, though the state of parties was very little modified, the Socialists overcame their objections to temporary decree legislation. The new Parliament consequently passed the proposals before the end of the year 1930.

The "dictatorship" of Brüning seriously weakened the authority of Parliament and prepared the way for the overthrow of the Weimar Constitution by Hitler, but for more than a twelve-month it worked without giving rise to serious opposition. The nation was engrossed in the economic difficulties of the great crisis, which in 1931 spread throughout the world. Trade became worse and worse; wages were heavily reduced in all industries; taxation remained high. During the year 1931 there were 17,000 bankruptcies in Germany. Several of Germany's foreign custo-

mers met the crisis by raising their tariffs, and this still further reduced her prosperity. Strikes, riots and political disorders spread throughout the country. Brüning decreed the dissolution of the Nazi "Brownshirts" as the most violent of the disorderly groups, but he declined to undertake a sweeping suppression of all the armed societies and associations that were bringing anarchy to the German cities.

The Conservative elements in the Government were now calling for a stronger man than Brüning at the head of the Ministry. In the spring of 1932 Hindenburg's term of office as President expired, but he was re-elected, being still a popular and generally trusted old man. Immediately after his re-election, Hindenburg set himself to bring about a change in the premiership, and after some negotiations another Catholic member, Franz von Papen, whose views approximated closely to those of the Conservatives, became Chancellor, with a programme of strong action against the Socialist opposition. Von Papen's two most striking measures were the arbitrary dissolution of the Socialist Government of the State of Prussia and the restoration of the Brownshirts. In Prussia a dictatorship was established under von Papen himself, whilst the Nazis were courted as allies of Conservative policy. At the same time special police courts were set up to deal with conspirators. Affairs were moving rapidly towards a Conservative dictatorship of a severe type.

In July 1932 another general election was held, under conditions of violent upheaval all over Germany. It was notable that the Nazis were returned as the largest single political party, obtaining more than a third of the seats in the Reichstag, and scoring 230 to the Conservative 37. Under these circumstances it was obvious that the Nazi tail was likely to begin wagging the Conservative dog. The Socialists returned 133 members, whilst the Communists returned 89. The Liberal party was almost wiped out, for the Liberals and Radicals together numbered only 11 members. Von Papen's position was hopeless, between the Socialist and Communist opposition and the Nazi wing of his own supporters. A vote of censure, supported by the Nazis, was almost certain to be passed. Von Papen obtained Hindenburg's consent to dissolve the recently elected Parliament. There followed a rowdy scene in the Reichstag, the Nazi Chairman, Göring, refusing to close the session and putting the vote of

censure, while the members of the Government picked up their papers and walked out of the House.

The second election of 1932 was as disorderly and riotous as the first one. During this year 250 persons were killed in political fights whilst thousands were injured. At the same time unemployment figures were mounting to the six million level. The conclusion of the Lausanne agreement with the ex-Allies, virtually wiping out reparation payments, had little effect on the internal situation. The elections witnessed a slight swing-over of Nazi votes to the Conservative party and of Socialist votes to the Communists, but the general position was little effected. Von Papen, despairing of a majority in the new Reichstag, resigned. The President sent for Hitler, leader of the Nazi party, who flatly refused to accept office under the Chancellorship of a member of any other party. After some negotiations with the Conservatives, Hitler abandoned the task of forming a Ministry under Nazi domination. Hindenburg now turned to the idea of a non-political military dictatorship, and General Schleicher was appointed Chancellor.

Schleicher might have made a successful dictator had he possessed more political experience or had he been better known as a statesman. A member of the old military caste, he yet had Liberal and even Socialist leanings. He wished to establish an *entente* with the Labour organisations and to organise the regular *Reichswehr* as a bulwark against the independent forces of the Nazis and the Stahlhelm. He boldly exposed the scandals of the East Prussia charity organisation, which had raised an appreciable sum—with Government assistance—for the agricultural sufferers from the slump and had diverted it largely into the pockets of the nobility and gentry. The Socialists raised a loud outcry against the Conservatives, whom they held responsible for the East Prussia scandals. Von Papen and his Conservative followers reacted against this by swinging over to the Nazi side. Negotiations were resumed between von Papen and Hitler on the basis of a Hitler Chancellorship. Schleicher was aware of this, and knowing the strength of the Brownshirts and other irregular forces he proposed to his friends a round-up of the irregular leaders and the arrest of both Hitler and von Papen. The plan became known to his enemies, who went to Hindenburg and persuaded him that only a Conservative-Nazi coalition with parliamentary support

could give the country a stable Government. General Schleicher was suddenly dismissed from office, and on 30 January 1933 Adolf Hitler became Chancellor of the German Empire. The new Cabinet was far more Conservative than Nazi, for, though Hitler insisted on the leading position for himself, there were only two other Nazi Ministers—Göring and Frick. It was at the time generally believed that Hitler was a mere figure-head and that von Papen was the real head of the Cabinet.

The party that thus rose to a share in the government of Germany had sprung up during the post-war years. In 1919 a small Socialist group had been founded in Munich by Antony Drexler under the title of the "German Workers' Party". A few months later the group was joined by Adolf Hitler, a Reichswehr officer of thirty years of age, who had worked as a house-painter before the war and who, though an Austrian subject, had entered the German army as a private and had been twice wounded and once gassed. A man of considerable determination and perseverance, and an orator of great skill, he soon came to dominate the little Workers' party of Munich, which—after Hitler had drawn up a constructive programme for the group—changed its name to the "National Socialist German Workers' Party". Known by its shorter appellation of "National Socialist", the party soon came to be talked of under the abbreviated form of "Nazi"—the first two syllables of the German word for Nationalist—though the "Nationalist" party was strictly speaking the German Conservative party. The group collected enough subscriptions to buy a small newspaper and for some years its activities were hardly heard of outside Bavaria. In these early days it was doubtful whether Hitler would retain the leadership, but after some furious disputes within the group he was definitely appointed leader—"Führer"—in 1921.

Under Hitler's direction the little party increased in numbers until it became a factor in Bavarian politics. The "Leader" realised the importance of both financial backing and a military force, and he devoted some months to enlisting the interest of the local business-men, from whom he collected large subscriptions, and to the formation of an irregular fighting-force, the "Sturm Abteilung"—Storm Detachments, shortened into S.A.—whose brown shirts soon became conspicuous in Munich. Within the S.A. he formed a smaller body of picked men which,

at first called the Hitler Storm-Troops, were afterwards renamed the Schutzstaffel—"Defence Ranks"—known for short as the "S.S." and wearing, like Mussolini's Fascists, black shirts. In the upheavals which distracted Bavaria in 1923 Hitler took a prominent part, and when the State Government under von Kahr abandoned its idea of fighting the Berlin Government Hitler started a wild march on the German capital. Before the little column could leave the streets of Munich it was dispersed by Kahr's local police with a loss of sixteen killed. The victims of this affair were, after the Nazi triumph, commemorated by monumental tombs in Munich. Hitler fled, only to be captured and sent to prison for some months. General Ludendorff, who had supported the idea of the revolt, was also arrested, but was exonerated and released on account of his age and his services during the Great War.

During the next seven years the Nazi party continued to grow, and it extended its activities outside its original home in Bavaria. Like Mussolini, Hitler combined a programme of Socialist reform with a strong patriotism, and condemned the old Socialist parties, as international organisations that were calculated to betray the interests of the German people. He also at quite an early stage took up the anti-Semitic propaganda that was already conspicuous in the Central European countries. In 1924 the party adopted the swastika badge, which had previously been used by the Conservative rebels during the Kapp *putsch*. The fact that the German Nationalist or Conservative party was very weak in Bavaria, where the main conflict was between Socialists and Catholics, enabled Hitler to approach "big business" with more chance of success than if his group had begun its activities in another part of Germany. By uniting social reform and sturdy patriotism with the championship of private enterprise in business he was able to appeal to widely divergent interests. "Big Business", in contributing funds to the party, undoubtedly believed that it was thereby gaining control of the movement, and when the great industrial magnate Thyssen opened his deep purse to the Nazi organisation there were many who regarded the party as thenceforward a humble servant of the capitalists and Hitler as a puppet of Thyssen.

In 1924 the Nazi party ventured to put up candidates for the Reichstag, and secured, under the proportional representation

system, 32 seats. Four years later there was a set-back, due to the temporary success of Stresemann's "policy of fulfilment", and the Nazi members were reduced to a dozen. The group in Parliament allied with the Conservatives and obtained much sympathy and patronising help from the Conservative leader Hugenberg, a film and press magnate who gave facilities for advertising the Nazi party in his newspapers and cinemas. A further propaganda campaign had been initiated in 1926 with the formation of the "Hitler Youth", a patriotic athletic association. In 1930 the first Nazi Minister was in office, a member of the party being appointed Minister of the Interior in the State of Thuringia. In the elections of 1930, when the distress of the economic crisis was making itself felt, the strength of the party in Parliament rose to just over a hundred seats. During these years Hitler kept out of Parliament—and as an Austrian subject he was as yet technically disqualified from election—contenting himself with perfecting the party organisation and preparing for the day when he could intervene in national politics with decisive effect. The most serious problem arose from the independent spirit fostered among the Brownshirts. These men had been organised by Röhm, who resigned after a violent quarrel with Hitler in 1926. After going off as an adventurer to serve in the Bolivian army in South America, Röhm returned in 1930 and was restored to his command of the Brownshirts early in 1931. During his absence the independent spirit had increased rather than diminished, and the concession of regular pay to its members—for which party subscriptions had to be increased—still further magnified the importance of this armed body within the political movement.

The increased severity of the crisis swept many millions of new supporters into the Nazi ranks. At the first election of 1932 the party returned with 230 seats, and retained close on 200 at the second election of that year. Hitler now got himself appointed an official of the little State of Brunswick—which now had a Nazi Government—to qualify for election to the Reichstag. When Hindenburg was re-elected President in the same year, Hitler ventured to stand as a candidate for the highest position in the Empire, and scored 30 per cent of the votes on first ballot as against Hindenburg's 50 per cent. On second ballot he scored 36 per cent to Hindenburg's 53 per cent, the Communist candidate,

Thälmann, receiving the remaining 11 per cent. One wing of the Nazi party, led by Gregory Strasser, one of its oldest members, wished Hitler to throw in his lot with General Schleicher's bid for power, but the Conservative alliance triumphed, and Strasser resigned from the party. Thirteen years after joining Antony Drexler's little workmen's club in Munich and barely nine years after his inglorious defeat and capture by von Kahr, Adolf Hitler was Chancellor of the German Empire.

The first step taken by the new Government was to arrange yet another election. A week before the voting there occurred the famous fire at the Reichstag building in Berlin. According to the Government, this fire was due to the Communists; opponents of the Government, however, declared that the fire had been created by Nazis with the intention of saddling the Communists with the blame for it. In any case the mere burning of the parliament-house was a stupid affair, hardly to be compared with the famous plot of Guy Fawkes. A half-witted Dutchman was arrested and found guilty, but if he were a member of the Communist party he was hardly a very responsible member. Three foreigners—two Bulgarians and a Macedonian—were also tried but acquitted. The trial was held in public, and was a very full one. The general impression left by the evidence was that the Dutchman had intended to commit this and other miscellaneous acts of incendiarism, but that the Communist party had nothing to do with the affair. The use made by the Government of the suspicion cast on the Communists, however, strongly suggested, if it failed to prove, that the Nazis, knowing—like the Government of James I in the Guy Fawkes plot—that an attempt was to be made by a desperate individual, converted the Dutchman's bungling crime into a first-rate blaze in order to shock the country against the Communists on the eve of the elections. Three days after the fire the Communist party was suppressed, though its members were allowed to take part in the elections. At the same time emergency decrees were issued which established what was virtually a state of siege in Germany. All the Communist members of the expiring Parliament were placed under arrest, and with them some members of the Socialist party. The newspapers of both the Communist and the Socialist parties were closed down and within two days four thousand arrests had been

made. Some hundreds of officials were dismissed and replaced by more faithful supporters of the Government.

Under these circumstances the general election was held. The polling was accompanied in many places by scenes of violence, and seventy deaths were reported. Even so, the Nazis failed to obtain a clear majority over all other parties, their poll amounting to 44 per cent. The Communists polled only 8 per cent. Since the Communist party had been suppressed by the Government, the Communist members were refused admission to Parliament, and this gave the Nazis a small majority in the Reichstag. On the meeting of the new Parliament a series of decrees was passed, the Conservatives and the Catholics voting with the Nazis against the Socialist opposition. The decrees were passed by 441 votes to 94. The Government was given a free hand to legislate by decree in all matters except the alteration of the constitution of the two Houses and the powers of the President. One power, however, was taken from the President by these decrees; he could no longer veto or delay the Government's legislation. The new dictatorship was to last for a year, but if the Government should resign before the expiry of a twelvemonth the exceptional powers would also expire.

The Nazis, armed with their new powers, at once proceeded to remove all organised opposition to their rule. They resolved to suppress every political party in Germany except their own. In June 1933 the Socialist Party was declared abolished; the other parties were persuaded to accommodate themselves to the wishes of the Government by "voluntary" dissolution. By the end of the first week in June, the Conservatives, the Liberals, the Radicals and the Catholic parties had formally ceased to exist. On 14 July a decree forbade the existence of any political party except the National Socialist party. The Conservatives in the Government had meanwhile found their position becoming more and more hopeless, and at the end of June they retired from the Government; had they not done so the Nazi majority in Parliament would have voted them out of office. There was now a purely Nazi Cabinet. At the same time the rival military organisations, such as the *Stahlhelm*, were dissolved by decree.

Meanwhile a concerted attack was made upon all Labour organisations. In May, Brownshirts and Blackshirts seized all the Trade Union offices in Germany and effected arrests of Union

leaders. Trade Unions were then dissolved by decree, and the Nazis set up an organisation called the "German Labour Front" to represent the interests of the workers, with thirteen Trustees of Labour—appointed by the Government—as its central council. For a while the Nazis considered the Fascist idea of a Corporative State, with a consultative parliament representing the various industries and professions. The scheme was strongly opposed by Thyssen and the industrial magnates among the Nazi supporters, and was soon dropped. A shopkeepers' organisation that had, since its foundation in 1932, given much support to Nazism, the "Fighting Association of the Industrial Middle Classes", received scant consideration from the Nazi Government and was dissolved by decree in August.

To establish control over the State Governments a decree established Nazi Governors in each of the German states, with power to select the Prime Minister. Hitler himself took the post of Governor of Prussia, establishing Göring as his Prime Minister. Opposition was ruthlessly suppressed. After six months of Nazi rule the internment camps established for political prisoners contained 18,000 captives: by the end of the year 1933 the numbers probably approached 100,000. Alongside of the political persecution went a racial persecution of the Jews, the Brownshirts showing themselves particularly active in this direction. By decree, all Jews were excluded from the civil and municipal services, from the teaching profession, and from the professions of the law and medicine, exception being made in each case in favour of ex-service men and certain other small classes. All marriages of persons of Jewish race were henceforward to be illegal unless contracted within the Jewish community. For all purposes of penalisation the "Jewish taint" was to be held to operate to the third generation; a Jewish grandparent was sufficient disqualification in the case of an applicant for admission to one of the regulated professions. By the end of the year, some 60,000 Jews had emigrated from Germany.

Christian churches were brought under strict control by the Government. A concordat was arranged with the Catholic leaders, under which the Roman Church was pledged not to interfere in politics, but there was considerable conflict over the question of the retention of separate Catholic schools and the independence of the Catholic newspapers. The Protestants proved

easier to deal with, and the German Lutheran Church accepted the Government's demand that Ludwig Müller, a strong supporter of Nazism, should be elected Primate of that Church. All the other Protestant Churches were subordinated to the Lutheran Church.

In November 1933 another general election was held—the fifth within little more than three years. It was held under conditions which were entirely different from any previous German election, for the only candidates were members of the Nazi party. There was no electioneering; voters marked their papers either "for" or "against" the official list. 95 per cent of the votes were announced as favourable to the Government.

Whilst the proscription of the enthusiasts of the other parties went on, it was hardly to be expected that a desperate quarrel would break out within the Nazi ranks. Yet such was the case. The Brownshirts, always independent and, as the largest fighting force of the party, inclined to claim dominance in the party counsels, were becoming restive again. The young men of the S.A. wished to stress the Socialist part of the Nazi programme, and clamoured for a more equal distribution of wealth. The industrial element of the great magnates, that had provided the bulk of the money during the critical times of the party, was strongly opposed to any extension of the usual Socialist schemes. Whether the Brownshirts had actually formulated a plan for seizing control of the Government is unknown, but on 30 June 1934 the Government suddenly struck at the S.A. leaders. There was not even the pretence of a formal trial. Several hundred persons in various parts of Germany were set upon by bands of *Reichswehr*, Blackshirts, police and other Government supporters, and killed. The most celebrated victims of this "blood-bath of 30 June" were Röhm, leader of the Brownshirts, and General Schleicher, the would-be dictator of the days preceding Hitler's Chancellorship. Members of the Conservative and Catholic parties were numbered among the slain, but the majority of the victims appear to have been ardent members of the S.A. organisation. After nearly a fortnight of "executions" without trial, Hitler announced that the country had been saved from a great conspiracy, and that the dead men were traitors of the vilest description. The Brownshirts were then given "a month's leave", after which they were reconstituted on a different footing under

strict Government control. German opinion was at first horror-struck, but it was soon apparent that the death of these people had left very little impression on a country which was by now accustomed to political murders, and on Hindenburg's death in August, when the Cabinet temporarily appointed Hitler as President, the electorate confirmed his appointment at the polls. At the presidential election more than 45 million persons voted, and of these more than 38 million supported Hitler.

The Nazi Government, if it wished to rely on something more than force for its continuance, would have to give satisfaction in two directions; it would have to take steps to counteract the economic crisis in Germany and it would have to assert Germany's independence and prestige in relation to other countries. It was the economic crisis that provided Hitler with the bulk of his supporters, and if the unemployment figures—which stood at five and a quarter millions when he took office—were not seriously reduced the Nazi party would lose its grip on the masses. Though the Corporative State idea had been rejected, strict state control was established over every branch of industry and trade. By 1933 the world was beginning to recover from the worst phase of the depression, though only at a slow pace, and Germany shared to some extent in this general process of recovery. Far-reaching schemes were, however, adopted in order to accelerate this process, or at least to tide over the worst period. An all-round reduction of hours was enforced on the major industries, a policy which enabled the work to be spread over a larger number of workers than before, though wages were correspondingly reduced. Thus at the cost of a general fall in the standard of living large numbers of people were rescued from total unemployment. The formation of compulsory labour corps, into which the young men of Germany were conscripted, relieved the labour market of the pressure exercised by the new streams of adolescents coming from the schools, and the adoption of military conscription in 1935 relieved the labour market still further. The segregation of some tens of thousands of political opponents in the internment camps also contributed to the relief of congestion in the labour market, whilst the severe restrictions on the activities of the Jews added its effect to the total. Unemployment figures fell to four million during 1933, and in 1934 they were further reduced to less than three million. There was little further im-

provement during 1935, but in 1936 the figures fell to a million and a half. As far as was possible, the available employment was given to persons who were definitely supporters of and workers for the Nazi party; thus a kind of vested interest in Nazism was created among large numbers of people.

The Nazi Government also adopted a strong policy of national economic self-sufficiency—*Gleichhaltung*—under which home industries were fostered. As in the war period, encouragement was given to the invention and development of *ersatz* products—substitutes for commodities that had been previously imported from foreign countries. Control over foreign trade was enforced by a strict Government regulation of the exchanges and of the export and import of currency. Even private travellers were forbidden, under severe penalties, to take more than a trifling sum of German money out of the country. The open development of a huge armaments industry gave further employment and added to the resources of the country. The Lausanne agreement had relieved Germany of the bulk of its foreign public debt; at the end of 1933 the Government arbitrarily suspended two-thirds of the interest due to private creditors of German subjects. An agrarian movement was instituted for establishing numerous small-holdings, whilst a minimum price was guaranteed to farmers for the main agricultural products.

A great deal was done to improve the economic situation during the critical years, but opponents of the new regime declared that the recovery was far less effective than would have been the case under the old conditions of comparative freedom. Wages remained low in comparison with the cost of living; ration-cards, as in the days of the war, were introduced over long periods. Foreign trade, reduced to methods of barter, shrank to an extremely low figure, though the Government claimed this as an advantage as increasing the self-reliance of Germany. Such foreign trade as was allowed was hampered by a widespread political boycott in other countries, where the public had been antagonised by the murders and executions, and more especially by the persecution of the Jews, which to people in the other great industrial countries seemed a savage reversion to mediaeval barbarism. The emigration of Jews did the same kind of economic harm to Germany as the very similar emigration of Huguenots did to France in earlier times. Prussia may or may not have

remembered that her own industries owed a vast amount to the arrival of persecuted Calvinists from France, but the ideal of racial purity among the population of Germany was upheld even at the cost of provoking a boycott of German goods in every market where Jews had influence. Even in 1936, when most countries had emerged from the severe privations of the great slump, Germany was relieving hosts of poor peasants and workmen by the "Winter-help" charity funds, contribution to which was virtually compulsory for all civil servants. The Government maintained, however, that all would be well as soon as Germany became completely self-supporting, and in 1936 a "Four Year Plan" of economic development was initiated under the direction of Göring.

At the same time the Nazi leaders were doing their best to pull their country out of the position of inferiority forced upon her by the Treaty of Versailles. At the disarmament conference organised by the League of Nations in 1932 Germany had presented a strong claim for the abolition of the restrictions which kept Germany's forces on a lower footing than those of other Powers. Unable to persuade the ex-Allies to agree to "equality of armaments", Germany formally resigned from the League in 1933, and in the following year Hitler announced the increase of the regular German army from 100,000—the number allowed by the Treaty of Versailles—to 300,000. In March 1935 came the momentous announcement that Germany had reintroduced conscription for the army—the navy and air-force remaining on a voluntary basis. At the same time the weapons forbidden to Germany under the treaty—tanks, heavy guns and military aircraft—were openly adopted, and a new German fleet was put under construction. Ten years earlier war would probably have followed, but neither Britain nor France was inclined to plunge into warfare in 1935. In June 1935 Great Britain entered into a naval pact with Germany, accepting the establishment of the new German navy on a basis of one-third the strength of the British fleet. France, though its Government was more than alarmed at the introduction of conscription and of the new weapons, contented itself with a protest at the League of Nations.

The Saar plebiscite was due in 1935, to decide the destinies of the district after the fifteen years' occupation by the French provided for in the Versailles Treaty. There was no wish at all

to unite with France, but a minority favoured a League of Nations mandate. In the result of the polling 90 per cent were for Germany, as was inevitable, but Hitler claimed the affair as a triumph for Nazism. A greater success was the abolition of the international commissions of control established by the Versailles Treaty to regulate navigation on the great German rivers, the interested Powers accepting the change in 1936. Outside Germany there was less opportunity for self-assertion, though there was much talk of what was going to happen when the Germans were strong enough in armaments to assert their claims beyond the existing frontiers. Meanwhile the crucial question of the Polish corridor was shelved by the conclusion of a ten years' agreement with Poland in 1934, providing during that period for compulsory arbitration on disputes and guaranteeing—also for that limited period—the Polish control of the territories acquired from Germany at Versailles. Even the *Anschluss* with Austria was fomented only secretly, and the collapse of the Nazi plot for the overthrow of the Dollfuss Government checked Hitler's hopes of a spectacular success in this direction.

The final triumph of Nazism over the Versailles restrictions on conditions within Germany came in 1936 with the marching of the German army into the Rhineland, from which both troops and fortifications were debarred by the treaty. At the same time Hitler denounced the Locarno Treaty of 1925 on account of its recognition of the demilitarised zone. This was rather a gesture of independence and a breach with the "fulfilment" policy of Stresemann than anything else, for the main point of that treaty had been the promised intervention of Britain and Italy against either France or Germany, whichever tried to upset the existing frontier between them. By abrogating the treaty, Germany forfeited her claim on the two other Powers to resist a French aggression on the Rhineland. From Hitler's point of view the denunciation emphasised Germany's preparedness to fight for her own rights instead of relying on the help of others.

There is no doubt that the successful flouting of the Versailles Treaty enormously increased the prestige of the Nazi Government among the German people. It seemed to prove that parliamentary democracy had criminally failed to take those bold steps which alone would secure the revision of the obnoxious Versailles provisions. It must be remembered, however, that

Hitler struck at a time when the passions of the Great War had considerably cooled down and when none of the Great Powers wanted to interrupt the process of recovery from the great economic depression by indulging in a war. The great reparations concession of Lausanne was given to democratic Germany, not to Hitler, and it is difficult to fix the exact date at which the unilateral denunciations of the Treaty of Versailles would have been possible without provoking a war with the ex-Allies or with some of them. The fact remains, however, that before Hitler Germany appeared at European conferences as a pleader, almost as a secondary European state, and that after the Nazi victory Germany "did what she liked with her own". The enhanced national prestige eclipsed, in the eyes of many Germans, the less pleasant effects of the Nazi regime, and even the protests of the other Powers and the press criticisms of the political murders and the Jew-baitings were regarded by a large section of German public opinion as dictated by a desire to "encircle" Germany and keep her down.

The severities of the "People's Courts"—established in 1934 to try political prisoners—and of the internment camps, together with the strict censorship of the press, though they effectively checked open propaganda against the Nazis, did not eliminate discontent and conspiracy. There was a group of Socialist leaders at Prague in touch with one section of the malcontents; a bolder Socialist group remained hidden in Berlin to plot and to disseminate criticism. The Communists looked to Moscow and the Comintern for help and guidance, and carried on much underground propaganda. The concentration camps were perpetually replenished with fresh batches of prisoners.

More open criticism came from the religious bodies. The new primate Muller promoted the formation of a new cult, which he called "German Christianity", aiming at bringing the Christian religion into conformity with Nazi political ideas. Another sect repudiated Christianity altogether and tried to revert to the ancient German worship of Thor and Woden. As early as 1933 the Protestant clergy formed a "Pastors' Emergency Union" to resist these movements, and from then onwards the Government carried on a *Kulturkampf* against the Churches. The trouble with the Catholics centred mainly round the educational question, for the Hitler Youth and the Catholic Youth organisations were in

the position of rivals. Negotiations for a concordat on this question between Hitler and Cardinal Faulhaber, the Archbishop of Munich, broke down in 1936. Membership of the Hitler Youth was now made compulsory for all. Throughout this dispute the Government continued to arrest Catholic priests and to subject them to imprisonment or to heavy fines. The Government, however, much as it resented the independent attitude of the religious leaders, drew the line at the suppression of the Churches, since it regarded them as useful bulwarks against Bolshevism. Extensive powers of supervision over ecclesiastical matters were entrusted to Kerrl, the Nazi Minister of Justice.

The persecution of the Jews did not slacken. In some ways it was intensified. A batch of decrees in 1935 deprived them of all the rights of German citizens, excluding them from the franchise and from admission to the army and the universities. None but Jewesses were to serve as female servants in the households of Jewish persons. A nice distinction was made in these "Nuremberg laws" between full Jews, three-quarter Jews, half Jews and quarter Jews, according to the degree of "Hebrew taint" derived from parents and grandparents. During the Olympic games of 1936, Jews were forbidden to speak to the foreign visitors who flocked to Berlin. In 1937 Jewish booksellers were forbidden to sell any works beyond those written by members of their own race, and even so they were prohibited from serving any but Jewish customers. The anti-Semitic feeling was kept alive by articles in the controlled press, and by the publication of a weekly paper entirely devoted to vilifying the Jewish race—the *Stürmer*.

The former degree of local independence enjoyed by the State Governments completely disappeared under Nazism. The local Ministries were retained, but under strict central control, and in 1936 the Reich Government took over the duties of collecting the local state taxes. The police system of Germany was unified under the control of Himmler.

By the year 1937 it was apparent that Germany under Nazi rule had revolutionised both its internal constitution and its relationships with foreign states. The democratic parliamentary system, which even under the Kaiser had allowed a wide scope for the participation of the people in controversial politics, had been replaced by the dictatorship of a single party which would allow the existence of no rivals. The equalitarian republic, with

its figure-head president, had given place to what was in effect a monarchy more emphatic than that of the Hohenzollerns. The states had become mere provinces of a unified country. Rule by Government decree had replaced the rule of parliamentary laws in every sphere of activity, political, social, economic. The Kaiser's persecutions had been narrowly limited to anarchist and communist conspirators of the bomb-throwing type and to a few individuals who came within the law of *lèse-majesté*; under the new regime whole political parties that had conducted their propaganda openly and had returned members to the Reichstag under the Kaiser were proscribed and punished by internment or worse. The political executions of a few months exceeded those of the whole reign of Kaiser William II. The change in foreign relationships was equally striking. Before 1933 Germany had been a "bad boy in a corner"—still working off the punishment inflicted by the Allies for the trouble caused by the Great War, which the victors insisted had been due entirely to German perverseness. Sometimes the bad boy had been sulky or fractious, sometimes he had been submissive and eager to show that he had "turned over a new leaf". Yet the position of inferiority always remained. Hitler within three years had torn up all the pages of the Treaty of Versailles that imposed restrictions on the people of the Germany marked out on the map of 1919, and it was anticipated that at the first favourable opportunity he would strike out at the territorial restrictions imposed in the same document. The ex-Allies had shown that they were unwilling to enter upon war to enforce the former restrictions; the forcible upsetting of the latter provisions of the treaty would certainly be resisted by arms. A general two-year period of conscription was introduced in Germany in 1936, together with a six-months forced service with the labour corps; in the same year two German battleships were launched, and German submarines—forbidden to exist by the treaty—appeared, like the famous "Panther" of Agadir days, off the coast of Morocco.

Another general election was held in 1936. There was the same single list of candidates—all Nazis. There was the same overwhelming Government success at the polls—the official figures gave 99 per cent for the Nazi party, though opponents declared these figures to be fictitious. At the great Nuremberg meeting—the annual Nazi party conference—in 1936 a great "crusade"

against Bolshevism was declared, and a formal alliance with Japan on the basis of mutual help against Communism was arranged. At the same time some thousands of German troops were drafted off secretly to Spain, where Hitler took the Nationalist Government under his wing, recognised it as the legitimate Government of Spain, and flaunted the Nazi swastika on aeroplanes that bombed Socialist towns. Only in one direction did Nazi Germany modify its truculent policy. In 1936 an agreement was come to with Austria suspending the attempts of the German Nazis to effect the *Anschluss* by provoking armed risings against the Vienna Government.

Germany in 1937 presented a puzzling picture to those foreigners who had known the German people of former days. The extreme nationalism, the fevered rush to build up armaments, the blatant self-assertion in European politics caused comparatively little surprise; they were regarded by many students of politics as the natural reaction against the "inferiority complex" of the post-Versailles years. What did surprise the outside world were the thorough and fierce suppression of democratic politics, the extraordinary reversion to mediaevalism in the treatment of German Jews, and the "freak" manifestations of nationalism such as the cult of Thor and Woden or the "purge" of the German art galleries of all works that were considered to display "non-German" principles. Nobody had felt very enthusiastic about the old red, black and gold flag of the 1848 democrats that had been adopted as the national banner of Republican Germany in 1919, but it was a surprise to most observers to find the new nationalist and militarist Germany flying, not the red, white and black under which the warriors of Bismarck had marched and which had been carried through the Great War, but the swastika of the Bavarian Nazi group, which was adopted for the national flag in 1933. In 1936 the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to Karl von Ossietzky, a German author—who was lying in a German jail as a political prisoner; the most famous living German next to Adolf Hitler—Professor Einstein—a peaceful scientist, immersed in the problems of mathematics and astronomy, was in exile from his native land, expelled as a Hebrew swine-hound. The most outstanding impression made upon the world by the Nazi regime was that it was spoiling for a fight with more powerful enemies than German Jews; for every observer that forecast a

war of aggression on the part of Bolshevik Russia or Fascist Italy there were a score that anticipated a second Great War with Germany as the central figure under the swastika flag.

DANZIG

The great port of Danzig, with a population of a third of a million, was arbitrarily severed from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles, and erected into a Free State under the supervision of a High Commissioner appointed by the League of Nations. There was a substantial minority of Poles in the city, and also a great number of Jews. Racial feeling was acute from the first days of the Free State, and for nearly fifteen years the politics of the city centred round the numerous disputes with Poland over trading and transit rights, customs officers, post-offices and the rivalry of the new Polish port of Gdynia.¹

The triumph of the Nazi party in Germany brought about a great change in the affairs of Danzig. At the elections of 1933 the National Socialists obtained a clear majority in Parliament, and proceeded to copy the moves of the Berlin Government in many particulars. The *rapprochement* between Germany and Poland resulting in the treaty of 1934 eased the situation considerably, and one of the important clauses of that treaty removed the special Polish customs officers from the port. Meanwhile the Nazis proceeded to forcibly dissolve all the political parties except their own and to treat the High Commissioner, Lester, with alternate apathy and insult; in 1936 he resigned in despair of coming to an amicable agreement with them. As long as the Polish pact holds, no formal union of the Free State with Germany is likely to take place, but this question—along with that of the Polish corridor—is likely to loom large in the comparatively near future.

AUSTRIA

The Austrian Republic established by the peace treaties was a very different kind of state from anything that had existed in that part of Europe in earlier days. Old men could remember when the whole Austro-Hungarian monarchy was ruled from a single centre at Vienna and even used the same postage-stamps; since

¹ See p. 165.

1848 the Habsburg dominions had been ruled from two centres, Vienna and Budapest, but even so the Austrian state had stretched right down the Adriatic to the borders of Montenegro and along the Carpathians to the Bukovina, including among its subjects people of half-a-dozen different races. The new Austria was almost entirely Teutonic in race and German in language, and the Allies had not been generous in their interpretation of the outermost boundaries of the German part of the old Habsburg Empire. One small area that contained a mixed population of Germans and Magyars—the Burgenland—was placed at the disposal of a plebiscite, after being first allotted to Austria. This Burgenland question caused much bitterness between the two former allies, Austria and Hungary; the plebiscite was held under Magyar control and was regarded as a bogus affair by the Austrians. In the end the League of Nations negotiated a settlement in 1922 under which Austria retained a population of a quarter of a million Burgenlanders, whilst the chief town of the area—Sopron—went to Hungary. A further concession to Austria was the plebiscite in northern Carinthia, where a large majority voted for Austrian rather than Jugo-Slav rule.

The Austrian Republic contained some six million people, of whom nearly a third lived in the capital. The new state was described as "all head and no body". There was bound to be a shrinkage of the city of Vienna now that it was no longer the administrative centre of a large empire, but its industrial and commercial importance might have remained under conditions of completely free trade between the former provinces of the Dual Monarchy. This, however, was emphatically denied it; the "succession states" embarked on a policy of economic nationalism and raised high tariff barriers against German Austria, which, exposed to what was almost a "tariff blockade", was soon suffering severely from poverty. Under-nourishment was even more rife than in Germany at the end of the war, and the food shortage lasted considerably longer. Even as late as 1921 the poor of Vienna were being kept alive by the sale of bread and tinned milk from Government depots at a nominal price, and a large proportion of the revenues of the Republic was absorbed by poor relief on a wholesale scale.

Under these circumstances it was natural that public opinion should welcome the idea of the *Anschluss*—union with the German

Empire. Local plebiscites organised by provincial Councils showed overwhelming majorities in favour of it. Such an accession of strength to Germany, however, was not to the taste of the Allies, and the peace treaties had forbidden the *Anschluss*. During the Paris negotiations there had been a moment when it had been on the cards, but France demanded the Rhine frontier as compensation and the proposal fell through. The Council of Ambassadors which watched the interests of the Allies after the signature of the treaties was sternly opposed, and when the desperate plight of Austria led to a request for foreign loans in 1922, the Council insisted on an abandonment of the *Anschluss* agitation as a primary condition of financial assistance. Popular feeling remained keen on the union until the spectacular fall in the value of the German mark in 1923, but the *Anschluss* remained in the background of Austrian policy until the advent of Nazi rule in Germany, which alienated many Austrians who had hitherto regarded union with Germany as inevitable in the not too distant future.

Parliamentary politics in Austria centred round the question of Socialism. The three main parties were the Socialists, the Catholics and the Liberals, the last-named party melting away into the two others after a few months. Dr Renner's Socialist Government held office until 1920, after which year the Clerical or Catholic party secured the dominant share in the Government. The leading Catholic statesman was Dr Seipel, himself a priest; he was Prime Minister from 1921 to 1924 and from 1926 to 1929. The Socialists were very strong in the Republic, but they never succeeded in obtaining a majority in Parliament after Renner's resignation, and anti-Socialist parties, usually with a Clerical leader, controlled the Government. In 1930 the Socialists were the largest party in Parliament, though they did not obtain a majority. Before the next general election came along civil war had broken out, and the Socialists were suppressed by force.

In 1922 at long last Austria succeeded in obtaining a substantial loan from the League of Nations to undertake measures to palliate the intense economic distress. By this time the Government had carried the policy of inflation of currency to such a point that the *krone*, nominally worth 10d., was selling at £3 for a million *kronen*. At the end of the year 1922 a League of Nations Commissioner took charge of Austrian finances and enforced stringent

economy while relieving the Republic with the loan money. Distressed as Austria was, this foreign financial control was by no means welcome. The Socialists in Parliament had opposed the loan as the "Geneva bondage treaty", and maintained that fair taxation of the rich would provide enough to relieve the situation. The Upper House used its delaying veto to postpone the ratification of the agreement as long as it could. It was an added bitterness that one of the prosperous creditors whose money Austria was seeking happened to be the Republic of Czecho-Slovakia, but a few years ago a province of the Austrian dominions. League control lasted from 1922 to 1926, during which time the civil service, which had remained bloated with survivors from the days when Vienna was a great capital, was reduced by many tens of thousands; many miles of electrified railway were laid down and a huge electric power-station was built at Opponitz. Probably more good was done by the enforcement of strict economy than by the expenditure of the £27,000,000 of the League loan.

In 1927 there occurred a free fight between a group of Socialists and a Fascist club in a little town in the Burgenland. It was the cloud no bigger than a man's hand. For from this time onwards Austrian politics developed that violent aspect that culminated in the orgy of bloodshed in 1934. The example of Italian Fascism affected certain Conservatives in Austria just as it did in so many other countries, and by the end of 1927 an irregular militia, the *Heimwehr*, was openly professing Fascist principles and talking of revolution. Two years later this body obtained an expert organiser in the person of Major Pabst—a hero of the Kapp *putsch* in Berlin. Since the Government did nothing to stop the progress of this movement, the Socialists organised a counter-militia which they called the *Schutzbund*. With the growth of Nazism in Germany, the *Anschluss* party proceeded to organise a Nazi militia, whilst trying to capture the Heimwehr for Nazism. By 1930 things had got so bad that the League of Nations protested against the Austrian Government tolerating the formation of these guerilla armies. Parliament proceeded to pass an act suppressing all irregular armed bodies, but no steps were taken to enforce it.

Vienna, the stronghold of the Socialists, was the centre of disorder. The Corporation of Vienna possessed the status of a province, and its energetic Council had followed a policy very similar to that of the Socialist municipalities in England, develop-

ing rate-supported social welfare schemes and constructing vast housing estates which were the pride of Austrian Socialism. In 1927 a big Socialist procession in the capital led to a regular battle with the State police; seventy persons were killed and hundreds wounded, and the law courts were burnt down during the riot. Shortly afterwards, a Fascist tried to shoot the Socialist Mayor of Vienna. In the following years battle between Heimwehr and Schutzbund in the streets of Vienna was avoided only by the massing of 12,000 Government troops in the streets that divided the headquarters of the two rival militias. Advancing parties of militiamen were met by rows of fixed bayonets behind barbed wire. After this affair the Socialists offered to disband their Schutzbund if the Heimwehr were also dissolved; the offer was not accepted. Next year, 1929, there was a similar performance in Vienna, the massed police dividing the two opposing forces, whilst in the provinces there were several desperate combats between Heimwehr and Schutzbund. 1930 saw the League protest against these partisan armies, and Major Pabst was sent home to Germany, though little else was done to discourage the organisers.

With Pabst's withdrawal, the command of the Heimwehr passed to Prince Ernest von Starhemberg, who openly proclaimed his intention of ignoring the results of the coming general election should the Socialists gain a majority. The election returned 72 Socialists as against 66 Clericals, with eight Heimwehr representatives and twenty Moderates. Throughout these events, since the resignation of Dr Seipel in 1929, the Government, under a succession of Premiers, vacillated between helpless neutrality and sympathy with the Heimwehr. In 1931 the Heimwehr struck out for power; the Styrian sections rose, proclaiming their leader, Dr Pfrimer, dictator. The Government, which at the moment was headed by Dr Buresch, a non-political civil servant, struck back, and the rising collapsed. Starhemberg was arrested, but released without punishment. The dictator, who had at first fled in panic, returned to submit to a trial which ended in his acquittal.

During these five years of increasing strife, the contest had been between Heimwehr and Schutzbund. In 1932, with the seizure of power by Hitler in Germany, the Nazis for the first time became really prominent, making a series of violent attacks on Jews and

Socialists. Meanwhile in Parliament the situation was becoming tenser. By-elections and personal quarrels had reduced the normal majority of the Clerical Government to one. On critical divisions absentee members would be fetched from hospital and hobbled in on crutches to record their votes. The Government was now dependent on the votes of the eight Heimwehr members, and soon the Heimwehr element was becoming dominant. Dr Engelbert Dollfuss, who became Clerical Prime Minister in 1932, saw no alternative to ultimate defeat but an open alliance with the Heimwehr and the adoption of Fascist methods. He chose as his Minister of Police one of the Heimwehr leaders of Vienna, Major Fey, who proceeded to ban the meetings of Schutzbund and Nazis while permitting those of the Heimwehr. A parliamentary debate on this policy ended in a battle of flying inkpots between the Socialist and Heimwehr benches.

Attention was now diverted by a recrudescence of Nazi activity. This took the form of bomb-throwing, often of a rather puerile kind; the total of bomb outrages rose in 1933 to two hundred a week, but few casualties were caused. More serious was the Jew-baiting that spread rapidly during the spring of 1933. Meanwhile Dollfuss was planning the destruction of both his enemies, Nazism and Socialism. In March, the Government was defeated in a debate on a railway strike; the chairman and his two deputies—all Government supporters—resigned, and as under the Constitution Parliament could not meet unless formally summoned by the chairman or his deputy, there was a legal excuse for suspending further sessions, though the obvious way out of such an apparent *impasse* was a fresh general election. However, one of the resigned deputy-chairmen eventually signed a summons for Parliament to meet; this did not suit Dollfuss' plans, and when the members assembled troops were sent to expel them. No election followed, and Dollfuss proceeded to proclaim the Nazi party an illegal organisation and to expel the Nazi members from some of the provincial Councils. In September Dollfuss openly declared his adhesion to Fascist principles and announced that there would be no more Parliaments.

The Nazi party appeared to submit to its fate, though one of its supporters shot at Dollfuss in October and wounded him; it had no widespread support in Austria and it had been forestalled as a violent opponent of Socialism by the Heimwehr Fascists.

The Socialist opposition would be a tougher problem, for nearly half the electors were its supporters. The blow against this party was struck in February 1934. Dollfuss had already stopped the grants-in-aid voted by Parliament towards the municipal expenses of Vienna; he now summarily ordered the dissolution of the Council and the disarming of the Schutzbund. The Mayor of Vienna, protesting against the suppression of the Council, was arrested and sent to jail. The search for arms among the haunts of the Schutzbund was resisted; fighting broke out, spreading rapidly throughout the city. Then the contest spread to the provinces; in Linz, Graz and Steyr there were sharp battles between Government troops, assisted by the Heimwehr, and the Socialist Schutzbund. For four days, from 12 February to 15 February, civil war raged in the streets of Vienna. The sides were fairly evenly matched, except in one important particular—the Government had artillery. Even against shell-fire the Socialists held out in their workmen's dwellings; the new housing estates were turned into fortresses. On the 15th the Government offered a free pardon to all who would surrender, excepting only the leaders. The Vienna Socialists were already almost beaten, and surrender followed. The official Government report gave the dead as 239, including both sides; the Socialists maintained that at least 1500 fell on their side alone. Most of the Socialist leaders escaped to Czechoslovakia, but in Vienna and the provinces the surrender was followed by eleven hangings and over a thousand commitments to prison, whilst several thousands more were sent to concentration camps. As a further sequel all Trade Unions throughout Austria were declared suppressed.

In April, to the general surprise, Dollfuss summoned Parliament to meet again. But it was a Parliament from which every Socialist member—nearly half the House—was excluded. The Clericals and Heimwehr members proceeded to vote a new Constitution, two members only voting against it and seventeen abstaining. Under this new Constitution the Government was to appoint all members of Parliament, and even so their powers were merely to pass or reject measures, and not to amend them. The new Parliament was not even appointed until November.

Dollfuss appeared to have completed his triumph, but his troubles were not yet over. On 25 July a group of Nazis suddenly raided the Government Offices with the object of seizing the

members of the Cabinet. They arrived during the luncheon-hour, when most of the Ministers were out of the building. Dollfuss was there, however, and so was Major Fey of the Heimwehr. Fey was captured; Dollfuss was shot dead as he attempted to escape. Meanwhile the other Ministers got in touch with the troops, and the Chancellery building was surrounded. The Nazi raiders, entrapped, bargained with Fey for their safety if they should surrender without a fight. The bargain was struck, and surrender followed. Fey's promise was not held binding on the Government, but a promise of pardon to the rest appears to have been offered if the murderer of Dollfuss would disclose his identity. The man who had fired the fatal shot promptly confessed, but in spite of this no mercy was shown to the others. Thirteen executions followed, and 700 Nazis joined the Socialists in Austrian jails, others going to the concentration camps.

The place of Dollfuss was taken by Dr von Schuschnigg, another Clerical leader. Prince Starhemberg and Major Fey formed the other members of a triumvirate which ruled the Austrian Republic as Fascist dictators. It was believed at first that Schuschnigg was a mere pawn in the hands of the two Heimwehr leaders, but events were to prove otherwise. Quarrels broke out among the triumvirs. In 1935 Major Fey was dismissed from office; he went without a murmur. The powerful Heimwehr chief Prince Starhemberg was now usually considered to be the Dictator of Austria. Then, in 1936, Schuschnigg proposed to replace the Heimwehr by a national conscript army of the usual continental type. To this Starhemberg replied that the Heimwehr would be disarmed only over his dead body. The majority of the Cabinet supported Schuschnigg, but there were 12,000 armed Heimwehrmen in Vienna. To the great surprise of the public, however, Starhemberg suddenly decided to abandon the struggle. He resigned from the Cabinet and retired to his country house, and the Heimwehr were disbanded and disarmed. As an anticlimax to his somewhat bombastic political career, Prince Starhemberg was appointed President of the Austrian Mothers' Aid Organisation. A week after Starhemberg's resignation the nominated Parliament passed an act under which all political parties were forbidden except the Government party, which was designated the "Fatherland Front", and which was placed under the despotic orders of the Chancellor —Dr Schuschnigg.

Aesop's fable of the sun and the wind trying their different methods of removing the man's coat applies very well to the history of the *Anschluss* movement. By 1925 both the German and the Austrian currencies had been restored to a gold basis, and the reaction against the idea of union with the German Reich had ceased. A strong party in Parliament urged union, in spite of the well-known opposition of the former Allies. After all, if Turkey had obtained a modification of the severe terms imposed in 1919 as a result of the Lausanne Conference¹, Austria might hope to obtain some concessions. The Government, though not unfavourable to the idea of union, felt that the time was not ripe. Certain steps were, however, taken to pave the way for closer union. In 1926 Germany and Austria agreed to accept one another's nationals in the allotment of the benefits of the insurance, pensions and education services. In 1927 a joint committee of the German and Austrian Parliaments considered proposals for co-ordinating the criminal codes of the two countries. In 1928 the occasion of the Schubert centenary was used for a great *Anschluss* demonstration. In 1931 plans for a customs union were discussed, and as a preliminary step tariffs were mutually reduced on the German frontier. At this juncture Austria was trying to obtain a second loan from the League of Nations, and France used its influence to make this loan conditional upon an abandonment of the idea of either political or economic union with Germany for at least the period of the loan. Thus the *Anschluss* was further postponed for twenty years, the period of the League loan. It was largely on this account that the opposition to the previous League loan was revived against the new one; it was accepted by a bare majority in the Lower House and delayed as long as was constitutionally possible by the Upper House.

The *Anschluss* naturally became a plank in the Austrian Nazi programme, but Hitler's friends proceeded to spoil their chances by the adoption of a blatant and bullying tone. In 1933 the Bavarian Minister Dr Frank, when on a visit to Vienna, made several speeches in which he denounced the Austrian Government as the enemy of German unity. Dollfuss had him deported, whereupon Hitler imposed a boycott on Austrian touring agencies and surcharged all applicants for passports to Austria to the tune of a thousand marks. The tension between the two Governments

¹ See p. 213.

helped to drive Austria into the ambit of an Italian alliance, and the suppression of the Austrian Nazi party by Dollfuss seemed to make the breach complete. Then Hitler changed his policy, abandoning the tactics of the wind for those of the sun; in 1934 he dissociated himself from the Austrian Nazi party and even refused to give shelter to its refugees, who had to turn to Jugoslavia as an asylum. After conciliatory negotiations, an agreement was come to in 1936, under which the tourist restrictions were removed and the German Government pledged itself not to interfere in Austrian internal politics; in return Austria lifted a recent ban on Nazi emblems and songs, and allowed the Nazi party to revive, provided that it remained law-abiding. The agreement was followed by a marked revival of the *Anschluss* movement and of the growth of Nazism.

As the new ruler of a quarter of a million German Austrians in the Trentino, Italy was far from popular at Vienna. The Tyrolean members of Parliament in particular regarded Italy as the worst of Austria's enemies, and their remarks drew from Mussolini a vigorous admonition in 1928, accompanied by the withdrawal of the Italian ambassador. Dr Seipel, however, made tactful apologies, and the former relations were restored. A commercial treaty with Italy was carried through in 1930, and in 1934, at the height of the tension between Austria and Germany, a pact of alliance was arranged between Italy, Austria and Hungary, a pact still further strengthened by the Treaty of Rome in 1936. This pact noticeably weakened the opposition to Mussolini's Abyssinian aggression in the League's discussions, and it also encouraged Austria to tear up the peace treaties by the introduction of conscription in 1936. This measure enabled Dr Schuschnigg to rid himself of the control of the Heimwehr at the same time as it restored Austria's prestige and put her in a better position to deal with the succession states. The Little Entente¹ formally protested against this armament, but so many clauses of the peace treaties had now been relegated to the scrap-heap that the Little Entente accepted the situation as more or less inevitable. Austria had already been freed from the liability to pay reparations by the Hague Agreement of 1930.

The despotic rule that Dr Schuschnigg's Fatherland Front established in 1934, though outwardly triumphant, was menaced

¹ See p. 58.

by widespread underground conspiracy. Surreptitiously printed pamphlets and newspapers circulated throughout Austria, in spite of ceaseless police vigilance and wholesale arrests. The prohibited Trade Unions maintained unofficial organisations which co-ordinated the policy of their members towards their conditions of employment. Literally thousands of arrests were made and hundreds of sentences of imprisonment were inflicted. The celebration of the first anniversary of the suppression of the Socialist rising was marked in Vienna by the deliberate extinguishing of lights over a large part of the city. The Nazi propaganda made considerable headway after the agreement with Hitler, and it was suspected that many of the participants in the revived Nazi movement were concealed Socialists. In addition to open Nazism and secret Socialist propaganda there was also a movement for the restoration of the Habsburg dynasty. In 1935 Schuschnigg had obtained the removal of the ban on the return of the royal family to Austria and had also restored the Habsburg estates to the ex-Empress Zita. The Little Entente protested vigorously. There was no immediate return of the ex-Empress and her son Otto but royalist propaganda made considerable headway. Early in 1938, Hitler, having come to an agreement with Mussolini involving the withdrawal of Italian objections to the advance of the German frontier to the Brenner Pass, sent a German army into Austria and overthrew the Schuschnigg Government. The proclamation of the annexation of Austria to Germany which followed has created a situation of extreme gravity, and the consequent reactions of the Great Powers are likely to have profound effects throughout Europe.

HUNGARY

Like its partner of the Dual Monarchy, Hungary emerged from the peace treaties a very different kind of state from anything the Magyars had known in the past. As in the case of Austria, the Allies had been none too generous in interpreting the boundary lines between Magyar and non-Magyar areas, and the new Hungary was a little state of less than eight million inhabitants. Although it is a food-producing country, the economic situation of Hungary was appallingly bad immediately after the war; there

was an acute food shortage, rendered worse by very bad management on the part of the early Governments. The economic "blockade" of the succession states prevented any rapid recovery from this depression.

Before the peace treaties could be drawn up, Hungary had become the scene of a violent and bloody revolution. The armistice had been followed by the election of a Parliament in the areas where the Magyars predominated, all males over the age of twenty-one being allowed to vote, the female franchise being restricted to those over twenty-four who could read and write. The Assembly, meeting at Budapest, appointed a Cabinet of Liberals and Socialists—in the old Hungarian Parliament, with its narrowly restricted franchise, there had been no Socialists at all. Count Karolyi became Prime Minister. The arrangements suggested by the Allies for delimiting the areas to be occupied by the various armies during the armistice proving offensive to Karolyi, he resigned office, and for a few days the nature of the new Government was uncertain. A small but vigorous group of Communists, however, settled the matter by installing a Government of their own, neither Karolyi nor the Assembly showing much interest in keeping it out. It was believed that Karolyi thought that the threat of a Bolshevik Government in Hungary would persuade the Allies to make concessions to a Liberal Government that could easily be restored by the authority of the Assembly. The Communist Government, however, proved more difficult to dislodge; under the presidency of Garbai, but with the unscrupulous Bela Kun as the guiding spirit, it proceeded to arrest its opponents and to establish a terrorist despotism.

The five months' rule of Bela Kun was an amazing orgy of violence. The Hungarian Bolsheviks hit out with equal vigour at domestic and foreign enemies. While a Ministry of almost unknown agitators wielded the Red Terror among the Magyars, the troops were hurled at the Roumans who had occupied the eastern provinces and at the Czechs who had occupied the northern districts. Whilst the Government called into being Soviets in the Hungarian towns and villages, Karolyi and his supporters set up a rival Government at Szegedin. For weeks chaos and murder reigned in Hungary, whilst the Roumanian army, defeating the Magyar levies, advanced westwards on the capital. At the beginning of August 1919, Budapest fell to the

Roumans, and Bela Kun fled the country. Terror was now turned against the Communists, and whilst thirty Bolshevik leaders were executed, many more were murdered.

On the flight of Kun, the Hungarian Assembly proposed the Archduke Joseph as head of the Government, but the Allies refused to deal with a Habsburg, and Stephen Friedrich became Prime Minister. A more regular election held early in 1920 returned a Liberal majority, and the peace treaty of the Trianon was signed in June. After the experiences of 1919, the dominant note of the new Government was anti-Socialism, for the moderate Socialists had to suffer for the excesses of Kun's Communists. All public meetings were forbidden except those called by the Government; a treason law penalising the expression of anything "calculated to injure the reputation of Hungary" either in speech or in writing was elastic enough to permit of almost any excess of despotism. The fact that Bela Kun's companions had been mostly Jews provoked a strong anti-Semitic movement which found vent in the famous "numerus clausus" law excluding Jews from facilities for higher education in Hungary; only 5 per cent of the available places in the universities and the higher schools were allotted to persons of Jewish origin. The Freemasons, as a secret society, were also declared an illegal organisation. In reaction against Kun's "People's Republic", Hungary was declared a kingdom—though without a King—Admiral Horthy, an ex-commander of the Habsburg fleet, being proclaimed "Regent".

This situation encouraged the ex-King Charles to hope for a restoration to at least a portion of the great Empire to which he had succeeded during the Great War. In March 1921 he entered Hungary, but withdrew to Switzerland; in October, breaking his parole to the Swiss Government, he left Switzerland by aeroplane and landed in his "kingdom", accompanied by Queen Zita. A few troops under Count Andrassy rose for him, but the Regent Horthy armed the capital and prepared to resist a restoration which would almost certainly have meant war with the succession states, if not with some of the Powers. Charles and his supporters reached Buda-Ors on the outskirts of the city, but finding himself outnumbered the King surrendered. The sequel was a law, passed under pressure from the Allies, exiling the whole Habsburg family from Hungary, and the King and Queen

were deported to the Portuguese island of Madeira in a British warship. Charles, who had developed consumption, died in Madeira in the spring of 1922.

After the settlement of the government, the first problem for Hungarians was the distressing economic situation. As in Austria, relief was provided largely at the expense of the currency, which was inflated until the *korona*, nominally worth 10d., was selling at 11,000 to the English pound. A capital levy of 20 per cent in 1920 was modified by the exemption of landed property from its scope. The League of Nations was called in, and in 1924 a League loan, accompanied by the financial supervision of a League Controller, was made available to the almost bankrupt Government. By 1926 the finances had been restored, a new currency had been issued, and League supervision was withdrawn.

Hungary before the war had never enjoyed the same degree of democracy as had developed in either Germany or Austria, and the reaction from Kun's rule prevented the establishment of the new freedom that had been conferred on the German and Austrian electorates of the years that followed the peace treaties. Restrictions were maintained on women's suffrage, whilst in 1922, by a Government decree which was not submitted to Parliament, the ballot was abolished in the rural districts, open voting—with its opportunities for coercion—being restored. General elections were accompanied by wholesale intimidation often taking the form of brutal attacks on Opposition candidates and their supporters. Public meetings continued to be strictly limited by the Government, and a severe censorship was maintained over the Press. Under these circumstances the Government obtained large majorities at each general election, and the members who were returned proved extremely subservient. In 1926 a second chamber of Government nominees was created. Taking advantage of the emergency financial measures necessitated by the arrival of the League Financial Controller in 1924, the Government obtained from Parliament wide powers of legislating by decree, and this system was retained after the departure of the League Controller. Both the elections and the meetings of Parliament became a farce, and the small democratic and Socialist Opposition in 1925 absented themselves from an Assembly in which they could effect nothing, though they returned

to their seats some time later. During the greater part of this period Count Bethlen held the post of Prime Minister; expressing open contempt for democracy, Bethlen found his most dangerous opponents among his own party, for quarrels among the Government groups and among the Ministers were of frequent occurrence. As the result of one of these disputes Count Bethlen resigned in 1931, being succeeded by Count Karolyi, who in turn was replaced by General Gömbös in 1932.

The most conspicuous Conservative opposition to the Government came from a group that formed the Society of the "Awakening Hungarians" in 1922. These people urged still stronger measures against Socialism and Communism, and carried their anti-Semitism to extremes; they also demanded a bold foreign policy with the object of regaining some of the lost provinces. Like most of the extreme Conservative movements in Europe at that time, the Awakening Hungarians were much influenced by Italian Fascism, though they never formally acknowledged affiliation with the Fascist movement. The leading spirit of the organisation was George Gömbös, an army officer who as a result of a successful political career obtained the rank of general in 1930 and eventually became Prime Minister. In the early days the movement concentrated its attacks on the Jews, who were already penalised by the "numerus clausus" act and by exclusion from the ranks of cinema licencees. Bomb outrages took place at Jewish business premises and Jewish clubs, and in 1923 there was a campaign of sending bombs in parcels to Jews and democratic politicians. Anti-Semitic riots were fomented in the universities against those few Jews who managed to obtain entrance to the courses. Count Bethlen regarded the "Wakers" as a noisy nuisance, and some of the most rowdy leaders were arrested from time to time. Gömbös, however, who had secured election to Parliament, showed considerably more practical statesmanship than most of his associates, and soon obtained admission to the Cabinet. Quarrelling with Bethlen in 1923, he left office, and for some five years proved a more dangerous leader of the Opposition than any democrat, allying himself with a small group under the ex-Premier Friedrich that had become openly Fascist. In 1928 Gömbös made his peace with the Government and entered the Cabinet as Minister of Defence. Under his influence reactionary measures were passed to revive

the old traditions of the officer-caste; duels were legalised, the punishment of the bastinado was introduced, and officers were given the right to avenge insults from civilians by using their sabres. In 1931 Bethlen resigned, and Karolyi, his successor, resolved to strike at the Fascist party, that was plotting its own revolution. Gömbös threw his former Fascist friends over, and forty of them were arrested, one of their leaders—General Schill—committing suicide in prison. Next year Gömbös replaced Karolyi as Prime Minister, having by now risen to considerable popularity with classes that had felt little admiration for the "Awakening Hungarians". On his becoming Premier George Gömbös received sixty-five honorary freedoms of Hungarian municipalities. He began his premiership by a studied declaration of moderation, abjured his anti-Semitism, and re-organised the Government parties as the "Party of National Union".

The government of General Gömbös was in effect no less despotic than that of Count Bethlen. Up to the economic crisis of 1931 the Socialist and democratic opposition had been weak and ineffective, though the Opposition members of Parliament advertised their cause by a succession of rowdy scenes, particularly in 1930 and 1931, making in the latter year a vain attempt to secure Bethlen's impeachment after his resignation. The crisis year, 1931, saw a little more working-class unrest in the towns, though the agricultural masses, poor and short of employment, seemed unwilling to risk much political activity. Though martial law was proclaimed towards the end of 1931, this measure was aimed at Fascism as much as at the democrats. The accession of Gömbös to power was followed by a campaign against Communist agitators, of whom some forty were arrested and sent to prison. In 1932 a small "Swastika" party was formed, on Nazi lines, but though it took eager part in the perpetual anti-Jewish riots which disgraced Hungarian university life for many years it was never regarded as much more than a joke: when it took to drilling a militia it was suppressed, in 1934.

The political outlook of Gömbös is hard to estimate; at times he seemed to be the honest patriot, aiming at a statesmanlike development of his country in alliance with the people, at others he acted like a dictator. It is noteworthy that he refused to follow the example of Mussolini and Hitler in abolishing all the Opposi-

tion parties and turning Parliament into an assembly of party loyalists. At the general election of 1935 the Opposition parties actually obtained a majority of votes, though the unequal distribution of seats between town and country constituencies gave the Government a majority in Parliament of more than two to one. The National Union Party returned 170 members; the largest Opposition party was that of the Small Holders, who held 23 seats; there were 52 other Opposition members. In the rural constituencies, where voting was open, the Government obtained a majority of 55,000 votes on a total poll of nearly a million and a half; in the urban areas it was outvoted by nearly two to one. Gömbös admitted the inequity of the existing electoral system, and promised to introduce measures which would give Hungary a fairer representative assembly. Whether and to what extent these promises would have been carried out by him cannot be estimated, for in the following year he became seriously ill and handed over the direction of the Government to Dr Daranyi. One of his last political actions was to exchange pistol-shots in a duel with the leader of the parliamentary Agrarian party, neither combatant being injured. A few months later, in October 1936, George Gömbös died, his funeral being marked by a fifteen minutes' silence throughout the country. Dr Daranyi, who became Premier, was reputed to be more favourably disposed towards an eventual return to democratic constitutionalism than his predecessor.

The economic situation in Hungary, though nowhere near so acute as during the months following the war, has remained very unsatisfactory. High tariff barriers, especially in the succession states, have impeded the export of Hungarian foodstuffs, whilst the world supply of wheat has been so large that prices have been low. In 1929 it was estimated that a third of a million Hungarian agricultural labourers were unemployed, whilst industry was suffering equally severely. The Government has done what it could to ease the distress, particularly in regard to agriculture. Subsidies have been granted to the producers of cereals, but the Magyar farm labourer has remained one of the worst-paid workers in Europe, earning barely enough to feed a family, let alone maintain a good standard of living. Just before his death Gömbös initiated a long-term programme under which 33,000 families are to be set up on small holdings during the next twenty-

five years. This, however, only touches the fringe of the problem. A wheat-exporting agreement with Italy and Austria arranged in 1934 has had some good effects. The administration of the finances—for a short time under the direct control of the League Commissioner—has not been uniformly efficient; the State enterprises have been run at a heavy loss, and the civil service has been consistently overstaffed, in spite of considerable reductions. In 1929 the costs of administration were absorbing 20 per cent of the State revenues; and in 1931, when revenues had shrunk and the services had been increased, the proportion had actually risen to more than half the income. The Government has not been altogether neglectful of social services; in 1928 Old Age Pensions and an Unemployment Insurance scheme were adopted by the Bethlen administration.

As regards foreign policy Hungary, like Austria, has been faced with such a multiplicity of enemies in the territories torn from her that some differentiation between the captors of the lost provinces has been inevitable. The very small annexations of Hungarian territory by Italy, and the political sympathy which at times existed between the rulers of Hungary and Fascism pointed to Italy as a possible new friend. In 1927, Italy agreed to open the port of Fiume to Hungarian trade; in 1934, Hungary joined Austria in a pact with Italy, and improved trade relations followed, whilst certain speeches of Mussolini encouraged the Magyars to believe that a revision of the treaty boundaries of Hungary would not be displeasing to Italy. There was trouble with Jugoslavia in the same year, when some Magyar officials gave shelter to exiled Croats and some assistance in their plots to stir up revolts across the border. The Italian alliance was further cemented by the Rome Treaty of 1936. Strengthened by the Italian alliance, Gömbös spoke out more boldly than his predecessors in office in favour of treaty revision, a course of action opposed by Count Bethlen as dangerously provocative.

Magyar public opinion has constantly discussed the prospects of the establishment of a real monarchy. The young Habsburg Prince Otto has always had numerous supporters, but since his chances of a restoration to Austria are equally canvassed there has been somewhat of a reluctance to commit the country to a revival of the Dual Monarchy. Some favoured the Habsburg Archduke Albert, but he definitely renounced his right to the

throne in 1930; others suggested a foreign prince, notably the Duke of Aosta, a member of the Italian royal family. The most curious suggestion in this field, however, was that of a group of Magyars who, in view of the great popularity of the English *Daily Mail*, which had for some years advocated fairer treatment for Hungary, offered to propose Lord Rothermere as King if he would agree to accept the crown. Meanwhile, Admiral Horthy has remained the Regent of a kingdom without a King.

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

In granting to the Czechs and Slovaks freedom from the age-long subjection to Vienna, the Allies adopted their usual generosity where areas of mixed population were in question; large districts inhabited mainly by ex-enemy peoples were included in the new central European state. Of the fourteen million people who now became subjects of the Republic of Czecho-Slovakia, 20 per cent were Germans, whilst close on 10 per cent were Magyars. During the peace conference there were several armed conflicts between the rival claimants to the territories of the defeated Powers in this area: the Poles fought the Czechs in the Teschen district, and had to be restrained by the despatch of Allied troops, whilst when Bela Kun set up his Communist Government in Hungary he sent Magyar troops to invade the provinces which the Allies were allotting to the new Republic. It was originally intended to hold plebiscites in the Teschen district, but racial feeling was so intense that the Allies eventually decided to decree their own partition, awarding most of the coal mines in the area to the Czechs.

When Austria-Hungary withdrew from the war, a provisional Government was established by the Czechs at Prague, with Professor Masaryk as President. A Czecho-Slovak Assembly was nominated to draw up a Constitution, and the old Austrian provincial organisation was adapted to the purposes of an independent state. The Constitution was of the usual modern democratic type, and provided for local autonomy in the eastern provinces, where the population was mainly Ruthenian, and more akin to the Ukrainians than to the Czechs or Slovaks. The Parliament elected under this Constitution in 1920 showed an almost equal balance between the Socialist and anti-Socialist groups, the situation being

complicated by the fact that each party was split into at least three racial groups—usually Czech, German and Magyar—which acted independently of one another.

The history of Czecho-Slovakia has been more peaceful than that of any of the new states created by the Versailles settlement. The great majority of the people included in the new state were of a stable type of modern civilisation, and the country happened to be in a favourable economic situation: five-sixths of the industry of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been situated in the area now allotted to Czecho-Slovakia, and the Republic was practically self-sufficing in all essential products except iron. In spite of strong racial feeling, both among the ex-enemy peoples and among the lesser Slavonic races—the Slovaks and the Ruthenes—an atmosphere of moderation and reasonableness prevailed almost from the start. There was much discussion about the amount of local autonomy to be granted to the Ruthenes and the Slovaks. The Prague Government was by no means unwilling to recognise the special position of the Ruthenes, but feared that too great a share of local control might lead to trouble among a people that was the least advanced of those within the boundaries of the Republic. A subordinate legislature was granted to Slovakia in 1923, and a local representative Assembly was granted to Ruthenia in 1924. It was notable that in 1930 Dr Fajnor, a Slovak, was appointed to the highest judicial office in the Republic. The whole system of local government was revised after very careful inquiry in 1927, a series of provincial Councils being established throughout the country. The Germans, scattered about among the mountainous districts that ring Bohemia round, though far from contented were not rebellious; the Magyars remained strongly hostile. In 1929 there was much excitement over an intrigue between the local Magyars and the Budapest Government, and Dr Tuka, a Hungarian who had thrown in his lot with the Slovak members in the Prague Parliament, was sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment for taking part in this negotiation.

The Communist party at first gave much trouble. Encouraged by the temporary success of Bela Kun in Hungary, the Prague Communists prepared to seize power by force. Dr Masaryk gave them clearly to understand that though no obstacle would be placed in the way of constitutional agitation, force would be met

by force, and the projected rising did not materialise. In 1920 there were some Communist riots at Brünn and in other towns. The party for some time refused to take part in parliamentary or municipal elections, relying on a future rebellion to transfer power to themselves, but in 1923 they began to contest local government elections, and their general attitude became distinctly more moderate. In Parliament, the numerous groups worked in a constitutional manner, and coalition ministries containing representatives of nearly all the political parties succeeded one another with very little friction in comparison with political conditions in most other Continental countries. The smooth working of Czecho-Slovak politics and the general tranquillity and prosperity of the country were largely due to the moderate and level-headed direction of two outstanding statesmen, Professor Masaryk, who held the presidency from 1918 until his resignation at the age of eighty-five in 1935, and Dr Benes, formerly premier and Foreign Minister, who was elected to the presidency in succession to Masaryk. Thomas Masaryk, the son of a coachman, after being apprenticed to a blacksmith, worked his way through the universities and became Professor of Philosophy at Prague. Always a champion of Czech self-government, he refused to support the Habsburg Empire at the outbreak of the war and fled to England. He afterwards organised the Czecho-Slovak corps in the Russian army, and on his elevation to the presidency of his country he distinguished himself by his calm and statesmanlike moderation. Dr Edward Benes, another life-long worker for Czech independence, was the president's right-hand man during the critical early years of the Republic, and was personally responsible for the successful negotiation of the Little Entente.

The most striking legislation carried through in Czecho-Slovakia in the years following the establishment of independence included the Land Reform Act of 1921, dividing up the larger estates into small farms, the capital levy of 1923, and the law of 1927 disfranchising members of the armed forces, on the ground that there should be no politics in the army. There was some religious trouble over the participation of the Government in the Protestant celebrations in honour of the martyr John Hus in 1925: the Pope withdrew his envoy and relations with the Vatican remained strained until 1927, when the dispute was settled. The

economic crisis affected Czechoslovakia, though not so seriously as it affected other countries: in 1933 decree powers were granted to the Government to establish, within fixed limits, duties on imported goods. Czechoslovakia, after an initial period of inflation, stabilised her currency by restrictions on paper issues: in 1929 the gold standard was adopted, and was retained without modification until 1936, when the currency was devalued by some 15 per cent.

Czechoslovak foreign policy has followed the lines of protecting the peace settlement boundaries and encouraging friendly relations with all countries that were prepared to abstain from aggression. When the Emperor Charles threatened to regain his crown, Czechoslovakia mobilised for war, since a Habsburg restoration at Vienna was regarded as the prelude to an Austrian invasion of Czechoslovakia. After the collapse of the Habsburg plans, however, Czechoslovakia offered to assist the Austrian Republic with a loan on easy terms. The obvious method of safeguarding the retention of the territories severed from the Austro-Hungarian Empire was for the "succession states" to form an alliance. In 1920 Czechoslovakia allied with Jugoslavia, and in the following year the "Little Entente" was constituted by an alliance between Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and Rumania. The three allies met at first at irregular intervals, but in 1930 a systematic annual conference of the Entente was arranged, which was supplemented by an agreement of the next year for a meeting of the three Foreign Ministers three times a year. In 1933 a Standing Council and an Economic Council were established, and the Little Entente became the most thorough and effective alliance in Europe.

With Poland, in spite of friction over Teschen, relations were comparatively friendly, and a further frontier dispute was settled amicably by reference to the League of Nations in 1923, the boundary near Javorzina being readjusted. A treaty with France, aimed at a general maintenance of the Versailles settlement, was signed in 1924. The most serious threat to Czechoslovakia arose from the Nazi triumph in Germany, for Hitler's ambitions included both the union of Austria with Germany and the liberation of the German minority in Bohemia from Czechoslovak rule. In 1934, after consultation with the Little Entente, Czechoslovakia entered into diplomatic relations with Russia,

and two years later Göbbels was moving the Nazi conference at Nuremberg to fury by declaring that Russia was massing war aeroplanes at bases on Czecho-Slovak territory. German hostility also resulted in a formidable Nazi movement within the Republic. The Fascist agitation which had been carried on for the last few years had never claimed much attention in the country, but the Nazi movement was considered sufficiently serious to lead the Government to dissolve the party and to arrest its leaders. At the same time the Nationalist political group among the German minority was suppressed. Up to this time, Czecho-Slovakia had been an essentially non-military country. In 1937 Parliament passed an Act establishing universal military training; "physical and moral preparation for defence" was to begin at the age of six for both sexes, whilst all fit men were to undergo military training from the age of seventeen to the age of thirty. At the same time a scheme of fortifications was adopted. Czecho-Slovakia had been drawn into the rearmament vortex.

CHAPTER II

Western Europe

FRANCE

At the time of the Treaty of Versailles the minds of French statesmen were obsessed with the past more than was the case with the statesmen of any other country that was to share in the victory. Britain's quarrel with Germany had been of very recent date, and though there was a widespread "Hang the Kaiser" and "Make Germany pay" campaign in Great Britain, it was noisy rather than deep, and the aims of the British leaders were generally much broader than the mere punishment of the ex-enemies. America's entry into the war had been almost fortuitous, and the people of the United States showed every indication of wanting to return to their previous isolation from European politics. Italy's old enemy, Austria-Hungary, had been smashed to fragments, and was no longer a serious menace to Italians. The smaller states were intent more on building up a large territorial future than on remembering past grievances. But France, which had for many centuries carried on a contest against the German states, and which had been twice invaded by huge German armies during the last half-century, looked at the approaching settlement mainly as a means of obtaining security from German aggression and of punishing Germany for all the troubles that the war had brought upon the French people.

The loss of Alsace-Lorraine had rankled for forty-eight years; that territory was, of course, to be restored to *La Belle France*. The Germans were to be made to pay, not only for the damage to French towns and villages, but for the whole cost of the war, including the pensions awarded as a result of war casualties. Furthermore, steps must be taken to prevent the Germans from repeating the attack of 1914 or from initiating a war of revenge for their defeat of 1918. Germany must be disarmed and denied conscription; the Rhineland must be either annexed to France or demilitarised. The German fleet must go. The leading German "war criminals" must be given exemplary punishment. Germany was an advanced industrial country with a population considerably

larger than that of France, and at every step in the peace discussions the desire for revenge and the fear of future aggressions were evident in the French point of view.

Those who followed the proceedings of the Paris Conference were mostly of opinion that the French Premier Clemenceau—one of the “Big Four” of the Conference—lived well up to his nickname of “The Tiger” by the violence of his severity to the defeated Germans. Yet this same “Tiger” was derided by a large section of his compatriots for having shown weakness at the Conference and for allowing himself to be overridden by President Wilson. When Poincaré resigned the presidency in 1920 Clemenceau became a candidate for his place, but the united Houses of Parliament—who elect the President in France—defeated him by a majority of nineteen, mainly on the score of his failure to secure better terms at Versailles.

The general election of 1919 returned a huge majority in favour of exacting the utmost possible from Germany. French politics have for long been a matter of adjusting the relations of a host of small parliamentary groups, but on this occasion the “strong treaty” groups formed an alliance which was called the *bloc national*. The Socialists, who before the war had returned a large proportion of the members, though divided into several groups, were routed in 1920, securing only 70 seats out of 626.

When Clemenceau was defeated at the presidential election, he at once resigned the premiership, being succeeded by Millerand, a more vigorous exponent of the anti-German policy than the “Tiger” had been. Shortly afterwards, the new President, Deschanel, was incapacitated by a railway accident and Millerand was given the presidency, Leygues succeeding him as Prime Minister. Millerand’s name stands out in the list of French Presidents on account of his active desire to increase the political influence of the presidential office. Not only did he put forward this theoretical claim; he interfered actively in party politics, championing the parties of the “right”—the more conservative groups—against those of the “left”. When the “right” parties lost their majority in 1923, Millerand paid for his partisanship by being forced to resign, Doumergue succeeding him. Since that time the Presidents have abstained from active participation in party politics. At the presidential election of 1931 Doumer—to be distinguished from Doumergue—beat Briand in the contest;

a year later he was assassinated by a Russian revolutionary fanatic, and Albert Lebrun succeeded him.

The rule of the National Block was characterised by unrelenting pressure upon Germany. When German troops committed a technical breach of the treaty in 1920 by sending troops to suppress Communist rioters in the demilitarised zone, a French army marched into Frankfort and other towns and remained in occupation until the offending troops had been withdrawn. The default of Germany in her reparation payments was followed by the invasion of the Ruhr in 1923,¹ which resulted in a further humiliation for the German Government. The animosity towards Germany was strong even under Aristide Briand's premiership, which succeeded that of Millerand, though Briand—a former Socialist firebrand, who was said to have "poured water into his Socialist wine"—wished to make some concessions to the Germans; under Briand's successor, the ex-President Poincaré, all idea of compromise was rejected. It was Poincaré who carried through the Ruhr affair.

Though foreign affairs dominated the politics of the National Block, domestic problems occupied a fair share of popular attention. For some months after the Versailles Treaty public attention was focused on the spectacular trial of the ex-premier Caillaux, accused of treacherous dealings with the Germans during the war. Caillaux had had relations with some suspicious characters and had certainly been approached by German agents, but the charges of treason were not proved, and his sentence was one of three years' imprisonment for corresponding with the enemy. As he had already served most of this sentence while awaiting trial, he was set free almost at once. The Government's domestic policy was mainly concerned with a religious settlement and with combating Communism. In 1921 friendly relations with the Pope were restored after a breach dating from long before the war, and a papal legate was accepted. Meanwhile the Communist movement had spread rapidly among the industrial populations of the large towns. Trouble began in 1920, when a great railway strike was provoked by the dismissal of one man. Army reservists were called out, under the penalties of martial law, to work the trains—in many cases the strikers themselves were thus used in their capacity of military reserves—and the strike collapsed. In

¹ See p. 10.

1922 a Communist attempted to shoot the President of the Republic at the national festival on July 14; French labour seemed heading for Bolshevism, and prosecutions were instituted against several agitators who were trying to foment a general strike. After a succession of local strikes, the "General Confederation of Labour"—the central trade unionist organisation—was suppressed by the Courts. A "general strike" which followed was effective only in the northern parts of France and collapsed after a few days.

In 1923, towards the end of the Ruhr affair, a general election was held. The Government suffered heavily from the fact that the heavy expenses of rebuilding the devastated area of the north-east and the failure to extract any appreciable amount of reparations from Germany had necessitated the levying of increased taxation, coupled with a proposal to cut the salaries of civil servants. It was this factor more than any serious relenting of heart towards Germany that put the National Block out of office. The *Cartel des Gauches*, a federation of "left" groups formed to oppose the National Block, secured 277 seats as against the Government's 267, whilst 29 Communists and 11 Independents completed the representation. Poincaré resigned, and after some negotiation, a Left Ministry was formed under Edward Herriot, the genial and popular Mayor of Lyons, though the Socialists, led by Léon Blum, preferred to support the new Government from outside and declined office. The Socialist groups totalled 102 members in this Parliament.

For three years the *Cartel des Gauches* ruled France. It seemed intent on reversing as far as possible the policy of the preceding Government. An agreement was made with Germany, the French troops being withdrawn from the Ruhr. The new French embassy at the Vatican was suppressed. The sentence against Caillaux was quashed. An attempt was made to suppress the religious teaching in the national schools of Alsace-Lorraine, to bring them into uniformity with those of the rest of France; an outburst of hostility which suggested that the inhabitants were regretting their reunion with France eventually caused the Government to modify these plans. The financial situation did not improve, and the discovery that the currency had actually been inflated by the issue of large amounts of new paper money whilst the Government was declaring that it would not allow inflation provoked a crisis. The Left parties, however, retained their

dominance, though Herriot resigned and was succeeded by Painlevé. In 1925 Painlevé gave place to Briand, who—now serving under a Left Government—negotiated the friendly Treaty of Locarno with Germany¹ and consented to the evacuation of the Cologne zone. The continued inflation and the consequent rise in prices, together with a further increase in taxation, completed the overthrow of the *Cartel des Gauches*, and in 1926 Poincaré returned to office with a coalition Government which included men of both the Right and the Left; Briand became Foreign Minister and Herriot took the Ministry of Education.

The "National Union" coalition lasted for six years. It failed in the object which most Frenchmen had hoped it would achieve, the reduction of taxation, and after considerable new additions to the taxes it was obliged in 1928 to recognise and perpetuate the recent inflation by stabilising the franc at a fifth of its former value. Creditors and those who lived on fixed incomes were thus condemned to lose four-fifths of their anticipated revenues, but the measure at least brought some kind of fixity into the financial situation and enabled the Government to balance its Budget for the first time since the war. Relations with Germany remained on the whole amicable, and France took a willing part in the negotiations which evolved the Young Plan for modifying the German reparations payments. French and German steel firms joined in an international "cartel" in 1926. There was much discussion on electoral reform, for the system of proportional representation was not working well. In 1927 France reverted to single-member constituencies, with the second ballot for indecisive majorities. Women's suffrage, which the Lower House had approved in 1923, was not seriously pressed, since the anti-clerical parties feared the influence of the priests on female voters.

During the whole of this period Communist agitation continued. There were numerous arrests, and in 1927 several Communist members of Parliament were arrested, being released to take part in the parliamentary session. There was also a recrudescence of royalist agitation, which was now taking on a Fascist form. The royalist party had never quite died out in France, and after the war Daudet and Maurras, the chief advocates of the claims of the Duke of Orleans, kept discontent against the republican system alive by their small newspaper the *Action*

¹ See p. 12.

Française. Their policy was to represent republican democracy as essentially incompetent, corrupt, and anti-national. The trial of an ex-minister, an ambassador and two under-secretaries for financial scandals in 1931, though ending in the acquittal of the accused, did much to discredit the parliamentary system, whilst the failure of successive Ministries to improve the financial situation of the country encouraged experiment with Fascist methods. In 1927 public attention was drawn to the royalist movement by the mysterious death of Daudet's son, who was found shot in a taxi-cab. The *Action Française* accused the police and the Government of concealing the true facts of this affair, and Daudet was sued for libel. After barricading himself into the newspaper offices, Daudet surrendered, but shortly afterwards he escaped by means of a bogus order of release engineered by his friends. The royalists had obtained a certain measure of support from the Church, but a quarrel between their leaders and the Pope, who in 1928 excommunicated them for disobeying his orders, weakened their position at a time when they were making more headway than they had made for years.

Poincaré resigned owing to illness in 1929 and several other premiers followed. Renewed financial depression brought about by the world economic crisis caused a series of Cabinet crises, and in 1932 the National Union Government lost its majority at a general election. The groups of the Cartel des Gauches formed another coalition under Herriot, with the support of more than three-quarters of the Chamber of Deputies. The coalition was a very loose one, and the continuation of the economic crisis, with a reversion to unbalanced budgets, provoked frequent political upheavals. Herriot was forced to resign before the end of 1932 for consenting to the American proposal to make France's debt payments unconditional—the usual French view being that these payments depended on the receipt of German reparations: his defeat in the Lower House was decisive—402 votes to 187. Paul-Boncour, Daladier, Sarraut, Chautemps, succeeded one another as Premier at brief intervals, and in Chautemps' Cabinet every member had at some time or other held the post of Prime Minister.

In 1934 both the existing Government and the parliamentary system generally received the severest shock which they had yet suffered. A financial swindler named Stavisky was discovered to

have sold quantities of bogus municipal stock alleged to have been issued by the Corporation of the city of Bayonne. Stavisky shot himself—or, certain critics alleged, was shot by the police—during his arrest at Chamonix. In the revelations that followed it became clear that some members of the Government had known that Stavisky had perpetrated similar frauds on a large scale eight years before, that the swindler was still nominally “awaiting a trial” which secret influences had continually postponed, and that his “Bayonne bonds” had been “pushed” by members of Parliament and even of the Cabinet. The official and unofficial disclosures which followed revealed such a welter of corruption in high places that had the anti-democratic forces in France been as well organised as they were in Italy and Germany there would certainly have been a revolution. As it was, Paris was disturbed by confused rioting at the opening of Parliament, Communists and Royalists both taking part in a series of affrays with the troops and the police in which hundreds were wounded and fifteen killed. A new Cabinet led by the veteran ex-President Doumergue—over eighty years of age—but consisting of the usual parliamentarians of Cabinet experience, failed to instil much confidence, and when the magistrate in charge of the Stavisky inquiry was found—like Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey—murdered, public indignation was roused to fever heat. Old Doumergue proposed to satisfy public opinion by radical reforms in the Constitution. The Prime Minister was to be given the right to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the electorate; spending proposals were to be restricted, as in Great Britain, to the Government; Government control of the civil service was to be increased by the prohibition of strikes in the service. A cry of “the prelude to Fascism” was raised, and Doumergue resigned. Flandin succeeded him, and by the time he had given place to Laval in 1935 public excitement had largely died down.

The discontent aroused by the Stavisky scandals was reinforced by economy cuts imposed on the civil service. In 1934 Parliament granted emergency powers for a few weeks to the Government, and as a result the service was reduced by about a tenth of its number, whilst the salaries of the remainder were cut down. In 1935 the grant of similar powers led to a further cut of 10 per cent in salaries. Riots in the dockyards of Brest and Toulon followed. Royalist agitation in Paris was renewed, and in 1936 minor riots

culminated in an assault on Léon Blum, the Socialist leader, in the streets of the city. It made little difference that the Laval Government in 1935 secured parliamentary approval for a dissolution of the riotous royalist societies, of which the chief were the *Action Française* League, the *Camelots du Roi*—the “King’s Blackguards” as they called themselves—and the *Croix de Feu*, a Fascist organisation. Though revolution seemed unlikely, the political situation was profoundly unsatisfactory.

As the general election of 1936 approached, the Socialists began to organise another Left coalition which could fight the elections with an advanced programme of reforms. The result was the formation of what was called the Popular Front, embracing the Socialists, the Radical Socialists, the Communists and the Trade Union party. At the 1936 elections the Popular Front secured 387 seats out of 615. The Socialist party, with 146 seats, became for the first time the largest single group in the Chamber of Deputies; the Radical Socialists secured 116 seats and the Communists increased their representation from 10 to 72. The Radical Socialists being rather advanced Liberals than Socialists, the “Marxist” parties were in a minority in the new House, claiming the support of 228 members out of 615. The Radical Socialists, in fact, as on many previous occasions, held the balance of power in Parliament. Neither the Communists nor the Trade Union party would accept office, the latter because political office was forbidden by their rules, but both sections voted with the “Front”, and a Government was established by the Socialists and Radicals, under the premiership of the Socialist leader Léon Blum.

The nation generally was calling for reforms more emphatically than at any time since the war, and during the next six months France witnessed “reformation in a flood”. Labour was granted the forty-hour working week, holidays with pay, and the formal recognition of collective bargaining in industrial disputes. The recent cuts in civil service pay were abolished, and a general rise in wages followed. The Bank of France, regarded as one of the most powerful conservative forces in the country, was reorganised under a Council of Regents which included the secretary of the General Confederation of Labour. The whole armaments industry of France was nationalised. All the great railways were brought under State control. The trade in wheat was strictly regulated,

and national control established over the coal industry. A central Board was planned to direct the entire French mercantile marine, and even the film industry was marked out for similar State regulation. The school-leaving age was raised to fourteen.

The Communists, who had refused office in the Ministry, were meanwhile exercising pressure from outside. Without waiting for the legislative programme of the Government to materialise, the Communists organised strikes in all the great industrial centres. Beginning with a strike of 100,000 metal-workers in the Paris area, the movement spread until 300,000 workers were out. The strikers adopted the unusual method of occupying the factories day after day and "sitting still". The *Confédération Générale du Travail* had not taken part in this movement and did its best to bring the upheaval to an end. A conference of employers and Trade Union leaders was arranged, but when the delegates met at the Matignon Hotel in Paris it was found that only a fifth of the employers and a tenth of the workmen were represented. The conference agreed on a rise in wages, holidays with pay, and the forty-hour week, as well as on the inclusion of workers' representatives on industrial Boards of Directors. The Matignon agreement was accepted by only a portion of French industry, and it was not until the legislative programme of the Government came into force that anything like a general resumption of normal work took place. A further Act made arbitration compulsory in all industrial disputes, but without forbidding eventual recourse to the strike weapon.

The Government took active measures to make the dissolution of the royalist leagues effective, and there followed a series of riots and fights in many provincial centres. Colonel de la Rocque, the leader of the Fascist *Croix de Feu*, accepted the dissolution of this organisation but promptly set up a new association under the name of the French Social Party. The Government also arrested Maurras, of the *Action Française*, and sent him to prison on an old sentence which had hitherto not been enforced. Extreme conservative publications, however, continued to appear, notably the *Gringoire*, which made emphatic accusations of corruption against the Minister of the Interior, Salengro; a parliamentary inquiry exonerated him, but the harried Minister committed suicide.

The increase of pay to the civil service, the extension of the

school period, and the great programme of public works initiated by the Popular Front Government sent up expenditure by leaps and bounds. At the same time there was a reduction of taxation. At the end of a twelvemonth it was apparent that expenditure had reached a figure nearly double that of the revenue. Unwilling to increase taxation, and prohibited by the Radicals from initiating measures to confiscate capital, the Government was forced to rely on loans and on schemes for the inflation of the currency. At first the Cabinet were strongly opposed to inflation, which it was feared would injure the financial prestige of France abroad, whilst it would certainly send up the cost of living. Shortage of money in the Treasury, however, at last forced the Government to abandon its opposition to this method, and after three months' resistance it obtained the consent of Parliament to a further devaluation of the currency to about two-thirds of its former standard. The adverse effect on foreign commercial circles was greatly increased by the delay, since it wore the appearance of panic legislation provoked by a grave financial crisis.

The lavish expenditure of the Popular Front, the rise in prices following inflation, and the handicap imposed on the numerous small businesses by the forty-hour week provoked a distinct reaction against the Socialist policy of the Government. The Radical wing of the Cabinet began to grow restive, and in 1937 a ministerial crisis arose. As a result the Cabinet was reconstructed. Both Radicals and Socialists remained in office, but Léon Blum yielded the premiership to a Radical, Chautemps, who—following the precedents of 1934 and 1935—asked for decree powers to impose economies. After fierce opposition, the increased powers were voted to the Chautemps Government, though only for a brief period.

Few nations are so essentially conservative as the French. Industry and agriculture are more evenly balanced in France than in other great industrial countries, and the peasantry are, in the main, small proprietors who have no wish to destroy the individualism which enables them to do what they will with their own. In industry too the proportion of small businesses is a large one for modern times, and attempts to socialise the means of production are not regarded with favour by any large section outside the industrial employees. Social life is also extremely conservative, and although the tradition of Republican France is hostile to the

influence of the clergy and Parliament has consistently shown a dominantly anti-clerical feeling, the Catholic Church has a very strong hold in the social field. Socialism, which a generation ago assumed somewhat extreme and violent forms, has become a very moderate political creed and the Socialist leaders are now essentially similar to those of the other parties. The place of Socialism as the militant element in French political life has been taken by Communism, which obtains its adherents mainly from the big industrial towns. The obsolete system of parliamentary constituencies—which has not been seriously modified since the days of Napoleon III—gives an additional weight to the conservative elements in the rural areas at the expense of the growing cities.

With the partial exception of the Communists, all parties are agreed on the essentials of national policy. Liberty of the subject and freedom to develop economic activities are cherished principles of the Republic. The supreme need of strong protection against foreign interference and aggression—always with an eye to the old enemy in Germany—is a cardinal point of policy. The international aspects of Communism have little appeal to Frenchmen, though the Communist party, like most Communist parties, is avowedly under the direction of the world-organisation of the Comintern at Moscow. The lukewarmness of French Communism is fully recognised at Moscow, and in recent months the French Communist party has shown some desire—if not eagerness—to bring about an amalgamation with the Socialist party. The reluctance to form a closer coalition between Socialism and Communism is now greater on the former side than on the latter.

In view of the essential similarity of broad aim among the numerous political parties—there are thirteen represented in the Chamber of Deputies and six in the Senate—there is a good deal of truth in the saying that the French Government is a machine which only needs someone to turn the handle, and that it matters little which party turns it. The multiplicity of parties is due also to other factors. The strong individualist spirit militates against strict party discipline. The fact that every party in Parliament, however small, has the right to appoint at least one representative to each of the twenty-seven Commissions, which—like English Local Council Committees—direct a great deal of important business, acts as an indirect temptation to active and ambitious politicians to throw in their lot with the smaller groups, where

celebrity is more easily attainable. The constitutional rule that a Government cannot force a political issue by dissolving Parliament and appealing to the electorate weakens the power of a Government over its supporters in Parliament.

Along with a great deal of sincere and unselfish effort for national progress, French political life contains much that is sordid. The secret compacts between the groups at election times are not conducive to straightforward policies, whilst the taint of corruption has never been shaken off from republican parliamentarianism. At intervals of a few years the country is shocked and Parliament discredited by the revelation of scandals of corruption and patronage which have done much to disgust the man in the street with politicians generally. André Tardieu, himself a keen parliamentarian, has declared that a French Deputy has three main aims—to do nothing, to draw his pay and to get re-elected.

In spite of the great tradition of Napoleon, modern Frenchmen have no particular love for the idea of dictatorship. The royalist and Fascist leagues have hitherto commanded the support of but a tiny fraction of the people, and the disturbances connected with their activities have been the work of small groups consisting mainly of very youthful persons. Only a great national disaster would be likely to bring an effective dictatorship into play in France. Nor can it be said that the French people are essentially militarist. The apparent militarism of France which has been severely criticised in some foreign countries at various periods since the war is merely one manifestation of a desire for security against aggression, a desire which is natural in a people that has twice within living memory been invaded by a neighbour people of much greater size. Since the Great War France has constantly urged other methods of obtaining the security which she needs than the building up of great armies.

After the Treaty of Versailles, France relied for future security on the carrying out of the treaty itself and on the special alliance signed at the same time between Britain, France and America. The American Senate, however, took the same objection to this special treaty as it did to the League of Nations; America would have no European commitments, and the treaties were not ratified. Britain then declared that without American participation the tripartite agreement fell to the ground. France was thus thrown back on enforcing a rigid adherence to the safeguarding clauses of

the Versailles Treaty and on building up a series of alliances and ententes with states in central and eastern Europe. Those countries that had received accretions of territory from the peace settlement were the most favourable to approach, since a war of revenge on the part of Germany would threaten their newly acquired provinces. Poland entered into treaty with France in 1921, after the French had assisted in repulsing the Russian invasion.¹ The friendliest relations were cultivated with the countries of the Little Entente—Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia and Rumania.

Meanwhile Briand came forward with his idea of a European League of Peace, but his scheme fell through on account of opposition both to the idea of excluding the British Dominions from such a league and to the proposals for an international police-force to be used against aggressor nations.² In 1932 France was expressing willingness to recognise Germany's right to equality of status as regards armaments provided there should be a general reduction of armed forces and that an international body should control the armaments of the European states. At this time, too, at the Lausanne Conference France gave up almost the whole of her financial claims on Germany. Any chance of agreement on Germany's part was, however, wrecked when France refused to count her colonial forces as part of her European armament—a point on which the French case was by no means indefensible. During these negotiations the Nazis came into power at Berlin. Germany left the disarmament conference, and shortly afterwards left the League of Nations as well. Then came the open denunciations of the restrictive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, and Germany began to rearm at a rapid rate.

The response to this development in Germany was a speedy *rapprochement* between France and Russia, culminating in the signature of a treaty of alliance in 1934. A further consequence was an improvement in the relations between France and Italy. Whatever wars of expansion Mussolini was likely to undertake, it was improbable that they would be at the expense of France. With a warlike and hostile Germany on her eastern border, it would be madness to provoke Italy into hostility. Thus, early in 1935 France entered into a friendly understanding with Italy—a factor which encouraged Mussolini to defy the League of Nations and invade Abyssinia. Though the French Radicals severely

¹ See p. 159.

² See p. 322.

criticised the Laval Government for its tolerant attitude towards the Ethiopian war, the advent of the Popular Front to power made little difference in the relations with Italy. It looked at first as though the Spanish civil war would embroil France with Fascist Italy, but—in spite of much popular sympathy in France with the Socialist Government in Spain—the Government of Léon Blum adhered to a policy of strict non-intervention across the Pyrenees. More trouble arose over the fact that France refused to give official recognition to the Italian rule in Abyssinia, and on the appointment of a new French ambassador to Rome in 1936 the Italian Government refused to allow him to enter the country.

BELGIUM

After four years of German occupation the kingdom of Belgium was restored to independence in 1918, and the Treaty of Versailles added to her territory the small district of Eupen and Malmédy and also a slice of German East Africa. According to the treaty there should have been a plebiscite in the Eupen-Malmédy area to decide whether the inhabitants would approve the transfer to Belgian sovereignty, but the obvious desire of the bulk of the 65,000 inhabitants to remain German alarmed France and Belgium, and in the end—with the approval of the League of Nations—the “plebiscite” was boiled down into a right of dissenters to register a protest. The area was a very small one, and proved of little value to Belgium, even from a military point of view, and on several occasions Germany offered to buy the district back; the Belgian Government was not altogether averse to considering the matter, but France, with whom Belgium remained in firm alliance for some years, exerted all her influence against any increase of German territory, however small.

The work of reconstructing the large devastated area was accomplished with great rapidity, and Belgium was given priority in the matter of reparations payments as long as they lasted. Fear and hatred of the Germans remained a strong feature of Belgian politics for many years after the war, and the armistice was followed by many outrages on Belgians who had fraternised with the invaders. A new French treaty was signed in 1921, and it was a matter of complaint by those who wanted to enforce Wilson's ideal of “open covenants openly arrived at” that the

military clauses were kept secret from the League of Nations. In 1926 the position of neutrality in European conflicts, which had been in force since 1839, and which had been so notoriously violated when Germany tore up that "scrap of paper", was abandoned in a fresh French treaty binding Belgium to support France in certain warlike eventualities. The French alliance was not universally approved; the Flemings, always jealous of the dominant French influences in Belgian life, were against it from the start, whilst the Socialist party criticised it as likely to commit the people to an unnecessary war. The anti-German feeling was beginning to die down at the time when Hitler rose to power in Germany, but the warlike talk of the Nazis and the measures of rearmament which followed their triumph renewed the fear of aggression from the east, and in 1933 a great fortification scheme was initiated on the eastern frontier—the Socialists opposing. Many of those who had assisted the Germans during the occupation remained in prison until a general amnesty was issued in 1929, but even in 1933 Parliament refused to agree to the reinstatement of those civil servants who had continued in their offices under German direction. A revival of the latter proposal in 1937 led to serious riots in Brussels.

The most violent domestic controversy was the old one between the Flemings and the "Walloon" or French-speaking Belgians. This became particularly acute in the matter of the universities. There were four universities in Belgium, all "Walloon"—French was the only language used for the lectures and the examinations. There had always been Flemish-speaking elementary schools, and Flemish secondary schools were allowed in 1910, whilst during the occupation the Germans had established a Flemish section in Ghent University, which was situated in the midst of an almost purely Flemish district. With the expulsion of the Germans Ghent University became entirely French again, and a bill was introduced into Parliament to make it Flemish, whilst leaving the Walloons with the other three. On a free vote of the Lower House—the Government professing a complete neutrality in the matter—the bill was approved in 1922 by a majority of four. The Walloons promptly rioted outside the Houses of Parliament, and the bill was soon afterwards rejected by the Senate. In 1923 Parliament effected a compromise; two-thirds of the study courses at Ghent were to be duplicated, with classes for Flemish and

Walloon students; the Flemings boycotted the new classes as inadequate. Seven years of agitation followed. A great sensation of 1928 was the election to a seat in Parliament of a Fleming who was still in prison for helping the Germans during the war; the successful candidate was then declared disqualified, much to the fury of the Antwerp electors. At last in 1930 Ghent was allowed to become a Flemish university. A further act in 1932 enforced a knowledge of Flemish on all members of the civil service whose administrative work lay in the Flemish districts, and also established a special Flemish-speaking branch of officials in the mainly Walloon province of Brabant and in the capital.

Belgian politics were conducted by numerous groups, of which the three largest were the Clericals—a Conservative party—the Socialists, and the Liberals. The Government was usually supported by a coalition, and in 1918 the three major parties formed an alliance which was called the "Sacred Union of 1914"; in 1921, however, the Socialists broke away from this alliance. In 1925 the Socialists again entered the Government in alliance with the Clericals, the Liberals being in opposition, but two years later, being unable to enforce a reduction in the period of military service, they withdrew from office. A period of rather fierce conflict followed, the most striking incident of which was the prohibition of the Socialist newspaper *The People* in military barracks as likely to prove subversive of discipline.

The economic crisis affected Belgium somewhat less than it did most other countries, and, having devalued her currency in 1926, she was unwilling to depart still further from the gold standard. Nevertheless the usual commercial disadvantages of a high-value currency were seriously hampering Belgian competition with paper-currency rivals, and in 1935, after a long parliamentary struggle, a further devaluation was effected. This crisis brought about a renewed coalition of all the leading parties, the great opponent of devaluation, Theunis, being succeeded as premier by Paul van Zeeland, who constructed a "Government of National Unity" in which the Socialists took part. The crisis also fomented the activities of a number of extremist groups, of whom the most active called themselves the "Rexist", formed partly out of the remnants of a very weak Flemish Fascist party. This Flemish party had been dissolved—along with a "Labour Defence Militia" as the result of an act against political uniforms

passed in 1934. The Rexists attained their largest membership in 1937, when their active leader, Léon Degrelle, persuaded a friendly member of Parliament to resign his seat in order that the Rexist leader could attempt to win a Brussels seat for the new movement. The premier astonished his opponents by resigning his own seat and forthwith entering the lists in Brussels as the opponent of Degrelle, winning the by-election by a handsome majority.

At the general election of 1936 the National Union Government secured an overwhelming majority, the Socialists being the largest party, with 70 seats to the Clerical 63 and the Liberal 23, whilst the Rexists obtained 21 seats. The Government programme for 1936 was an ambitious one, and included the forty-hour week, a universal grant of six days' holiday in industry on full pay, the raising of the school age, national control of the armaments industry, and the compulsory retirement of civil servants at sixty instead of at sixty-five. Van Zeeland, who was forty-four years of age on his elevation to the premiership, was a man of great activity, and after his Brussels election exploit was subjected to a violent attack as an ex-director of the Belgian National Bank. Degrelle was a shareholder in this bank, and the Rexists accused the Premier and the bank directors of financial irregularities. The Minister of Finance, De Man, held an inquiry into the charges, which he declared were unjustified, and the Governor of the Bank, Franck, sued Degrelle for libel. After a vote of confidence in van Zeeland had been carried in the House by a majority of 130 to 34, the excitement over this sensation died down.

In spite of the bitterness of the Flemish-Walloon controversy, of which the Rexist conflict is largely a continuation, the Belgian people have continued to make good progress in industrial and social organisation. The new Constitution of 1920 guaranteed universal male suffrage for Parliament and votes for both sexes in municipal elections. In 1925 an important insurance scheme was launched to provide pensions for office-workers. Belgium was long in recognising the Bolshevik Government of Russia, but after the rise of Nazism in Germany negotiations were opened in that direction. King Albert, who had led his army during the whole course of the war, met his death in a mountaineering accident in 1934, a royal tragedy which was succeeded a year later by a terrible motoring accident to his son King Leopold III,

whose queen, the Princess Astrid of Sweden, was killed. The extensive colonial possessions in central Africa, comprising the Congo Free State and the Ruanda-Urundi provinces taken from Germany, have been administered efficiently and quietly, in great contrast to the state of affairs in that region during the reign of Leopold II. In the Congo area Belgium rules some ten millions of people inhabiting an area approaching a million square miles in extent. Great progress has been made since the war in combating the numerous plagues and pests of the colony; the cattle plague has been suppressed in Ruanda-Urundi, sleeping sickness has been reduced, and hundreds of thousands of natives have been inoculated against the attacks of the terrible tsetse fly. In spite of some conspicuous disadvantages and weaknesses, Belgium is one of the most progressive and prosperous of the smaller states of Europe—its population is little more than eight millions—and its withdrawal from entangling alliances in 1936, when the French treaty was brought to an end, has increased rather than diminished its prestige.

THE NETHERLANDS

In view of the neutrality of the Kingdom of the Netherlands during the war, foreigners were somewhat amused to see Amsterdam placarded with political posters urging, "Dutchmen, No more war!" Yet the people of Holland had suffered acutely during the war, for the high prices offered in starving Germany for food supplies had tempted dealers to send stocks over the frontier. As the Allied blockade strictly rationed the Netherlands to quotas based on the population, this meant shortage and high prices in Holland. The later period of the war was, in fact, a time of great suffering among the Dutch people, and the return to peace was welcomed by all except a few profiteers. The war left an aftermath in the dispute with the Allies over the shelter given to the ex-Kaiser, but though various politicians in foreign countries had promised to "hang the Kaiser" they stopped short of seizing him from his refuge at Doorn by force, and Holland consistently refused to betray the hospitality shown to a ruler with whom she had never been at war.

There was more trouble, however, in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, which was ruled as an independent state by a junior

branch of the House of Orange. The Grand Duchess Marie Adelaide, whose little state had been used as a corridor into France by the German armies, had shown no hesitation about treating the invaders as friends, and the reaction after Germany's defeat forced her to abdicate, and in 1921 she became a nun in an Italian convent. Her sister Charlotte was proclaimed Grand Duchess in 1919, and was accepted by the electors in a referendum which gave her four times the number of votes scored by the republicans. Another referendum, on the future of Luxembourg customs arrangements, confirmed the abandonment of the former customs union with Germany and showed a majority of nearly four to one in favour of union with France as against Belgium. In spite of this decisive expression of opinion, however, the Government negotiated a customs union with the latter country in 1921, with safeguards against the importation of cheap Belgian corn; in return for the treaty Belgium granted a loan to Luxembourg at the low rate of 2 per cent.

The readjustment of Belgium's position in Europe led to long negotiations with the Dutch concerning Antwerp and the navigation of the Scheldt. In 1925 Holland consented to the fortification of Antwerp, but the Scheldt Treaty, though accepted by Belgium, was rejected by the Dutch Parliament in 1927, and later negotiations for a settlement of conflicting claims in the river broke down in 1935.

Dutch politics are confused by the existence of a multitude of political parties, which reached their maximum of diversity at the general election of 1933, when no less than fifty-three parties solicited the votes of the electorate; only eleven of them, however, were able to secure parliamentary representation. The religious parties, Catholic and Protestant, were very strong, with the Socialist groups as good runners-up. The Socialists for long adopted a republican attitude, but in 1926 the party for the first time attended the official opening of Parliament by the Queen, and thenceforward the republican agitation died down until 1930, when there was another withdrawal of Socialist members from the House on the occasion of the Queen's visit. It was this antagonism to the dynasty which led the majority in Parliament to pass an Act excluding Socialists from State office in 1934, the same ban being extended to the Nazis, who had founded a small party in Holland under the leadership of Mussert. Another Act

of 1936 prohibited the wearing of political uniforms. The Nazis were strong enough to win two seats at the elections of 1935.

Women's suffrage was adopted in Holland in 1921, and in the following year an amendment to the Constitution substituted triennial general elections for the previous system of retiring a third of the members each year. After the war, Holland experimented with a forty-five-hour working week, but this was modified to the forty-eight-hour week in 1922. The great economic crisis of 1931 led Holland, as it led Great Britain, to abandon her Free Trade tradition; already it had been proposed to impose a tariff on certain articles to pay for an increase in the navy, but this scheme was rejected in Parliament after a huge petition against the naval increase had been presented in 1923. Free Trade, however, remained the basis of Dutch commercial policy until the raising of tariff barriers in other countries provoked the adoption of a mild retaliatory Protection. But the Dutch remained Free Trade at heart, and it was at the instigation of Holland that the Oslo Pact for low tariffs was arranged between the smaller nations of northern Europe in 1930.¹ Dutch commerce suffered considerably by her retention of the gold standard long after most other nations had abandoned it. Returning to gold in 1925, Holland was the last European country to maintain the full gold standard after the crisis of 1931. In 1936, however, the currency was devalued by some 20 per cent.

It is often forgotten that Holland, with a population of about eight millions, rules a colonial empire which contains a population of fifty millions. The more educated Mohammedans of the Dutch East Indies were demanding self-government, and in the years following the war, largely as the result of the freeing of Mohammedan peoples in the Near East, the Malay archipelago was seething with unrest. As a concession to native demands, the Dutch Parliament abolished the terms "colonies" and "possessions" in 1921, but asserted its determination to retain the overseas empire by a declaration that these dominions were an integral part of the Netherlands. At the same time a Council was established at Batavia for the East Indies, half the members being elected by colonists and natives in equal proportions and half being nominated by the Government. Agitation continued, accompanied by strikes and riots, and the Government at Amsterdam

¹ See p. 211.

tried to effect a more workable compromise by modifying the composition of the assembly—which was called the *Volksraad*, or People's Council. In 1923 the elected element was increased to nearly two-thirds, and the native members were brought up to half the assembly, but financial control was reserved to the Amsterdam Parliament. In 1925 a return was made to the former weighting by reducing the elected element to less than half the assembly.

The native leaders were in some cases men of high intelligence; two members of the *Volksraad* were university men, one having obtained a degree at Leyden. They showed constructive capacity in the founding of native schools and savings banks. The disorders that accompanied the home rule agitation, however, led to the arrest of the native leaders and the formation of concentration camps in Dutch New Guinea. Meanwhile Communist agents were busy gaining converts, and in 1926 there was a Communist rebellion in Java, the disturbances extending to Sumatra in the following year. In 1927 a further alteration in the *Volksraad* assured a majority to the colonists, though self-government on a limited scale was extended by the formation of a provincial Council in western Java in 1926.

The world economic crisis brought ruin to thousands of rubber cultivators in the East Indies and intensified the discontent. The Dutch did their best to alleviate the distress, subsidising the establishment of new industries in the islands; forced labour had been abolished in 1930. An additional upheaval was caused by the spectacular mutiny of the crew of the training-ship "Seven Provinces" in 1933, following a cut in pay and an order to perform military duties on land. The ship steamed off along the coast of Java, but after being bombed by aeroplanes the mutineers surrendered and the leaders were sent to prison.

The wealth of natural resources in rubber and petroleum made the Dutch East Indies of vast importance in the economic world, and "big business" interests—particularly in the petrol industry—are strong in its administration. The competition of the big petrol combines, the native demands for self-government, the activities of Communists, and the fear of an eventual Japanese aggression on this vast storehouse of raw materials give to the politics of the Dutch colonial empire an interest that may become of cardinal importance in the future.

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland, with a population less than that of London—a federal republic composed of twenty-two cantons, each with its own local parliament—seems to the foreigner pre-eminently a country that can have little or no history in modern times. Yet both internal and foreign problems are matters of great importance for the Swiss people, who are divided into three racial groups, speaking German, French and Italian respectively. The neutrality of Switzerland has in the past been guaranteed by the Great Powers, and this neutrality was strictly maintained during the Great War. When the League of Nations was formed, though Geneva was selected as its headquarters, the Swiss people hesitated about joining it, since the Covenant seemed likely to draw them into international conflicts from which their past neutrality had screened them. By a majority of 100,000 in a referendum of nearly a quarter of a million votes it was, however, decided to join the League, but on the distinct understanding that Switzerland would neither join in any military sanctions against a violator of the Covenant nor permit League troops to cross her territory.

Wedged in between three of the Powers, Switzerland had indeed to worry about her position in a future war, especially since the development of motor transport and aircraft might tempt an aggressor to use the mountainous regions of central Europe as a base or as a means of invading an enemy country. The neutrality of Belgium had not been regarded in the last war. The danger increased with the growth of militant regimes in Germany and Italy. Even without a European war, Switzerland found herself drawn into unpleasant complications with her militarist neighbours. In 1926 a meeting of Italian exiles to protest against the murder of Matteotti provoked a riot by Fascists, and when Mussolini publicly congratulated the rioters on their action tension became acute. The Italian Press, too, was constantly harping on the idea of bringing the Italian-speaking cantons into the kingdom of Italy. There were also incidents on the frontier at Lake Ticino, when the Italian police arrested returned exiles who were alleged, on the one side, to have been abetted by the Swiss, and, on the other, to have been kidnapped by Italians on Swiss territory. Nazi Germany also found cause to quarrel with Switzerland for

sheltering exiles, particularly Jews. In 1935 a Jew named Bernard Jacob was kidnapped from Basle by Nazis and taken into Germany to be tried; the facts of this case were so glaring that Germany handed the prisoner back to the Swiss authorities, who promptly expelled him to France for forging a passport. The assassination of a Nazi agent in Switzerland also led to serious friction.

Though refusing to entertain the idea of military sanctions, Switzerland partially approved of the economic sanctions of the League against Italy in 1935. The complete adoption of the sanctions programme would cut off 10 per cent of her exports, and as a compromise Switzerland agreed to limit her exports to Italy to the amount recorded for the year 1934.

The most continuous foreign controversy, however, after the war, was the question of the economic zones of Savoy. When France acquired this territory under Napoleon III, she agreed to raise no customs barrier between the province and Switzerland, and the French tariffs were enforced only at a frontier some distance southward of the Lake of Geneva. France now wanted to advance this customs barrier to the political frontier on the lake, but the proposal to accept a new treaty to this effect was rejected on a referendum in Switzerland by a four to one majority. The Treaty of Versailles had provided for such an adjustment of customs arrangements, but only if the two countries concerned could come to an agreement on the matter. After long negotiations the French took the step of shifting the customs frontier forward without waiting for agreement, and the matter was referred to the Hague Court. Great irritation was provoked by the fact that France began erecting permanent customs-houses before the Hague Court had even considered the question. France, too, put many obstacles in the way of submitting the matter to the Hague, but at last, in 1929, the case was heard. The verdict of the Court was against France. France then raised supplementary points and procured a fresh hearing, which took place in 1932; again the French were beaten. France accepted the verdict, and in the following year the customs barrier returned to its old position. A minor customs adjustment at the other end of Switzerland brought the tiny principality of Liechtenstein, formerly attached to Austria, into customs union with Switzerland in 1923, following a postal agreement of 1922.

The shadow of European complications constantly haunted the

Swiss Government. In 1935 the period of military service was extended, after confirmation by referendum. Anti-gas precautions were instituted throughout Switzerland in the same year, the Socialist Council of Geneva Canton refusing to carry them out as they were held to be inconsistent with their policy of pacifism. Federal officials, however, secured the extension of the precautions to this canton. To avoid unnecessary complications with foreign states, a measure to prohibit all Swiss citizens from accepting foreign decorations was approved by referendum in 1931.

Extremist politics did not make serious headway in Switzerland until after the economic crisis of 1931. Communist riots took place in Zürich and Geneva in 1932, troops having to be called out to suppress them. Geneva was the chief Communist centre, and the local Socialist leader, Nicole, an extreme left-wing agitator, though sentenced to six months imprisonment in 1933, won the cantonal elections later in that year. He formed a "Popular Front" with the Communists, and controlled the majority in the cantonal assembly for three years. In 1936, however, the Socialists were defeated in the elections in this, the only canton that had witnessed a Socialist majority. Various "Fronts" appeared in 1933 to challenge the efficiency of parliamentary government, but in Switzerland the constant use of referendum and initiative considerably modifies parliamentary democracy, and the movements made little progress. Political uniforms were prohibited in that year, owing to fights between uniformed "Frontists" and Socialists. An initiative organised by the Fronts to demand a revision of the Constitution was defeated in 1935, and only one Frontist—belonging to Dr Henne's Nazi group—succeeded in obtaining election to the Swiss Parliament. The tiny group of Swiss Fascists, under Colonel Fonjallaz, effected little.

Relations with Russia remained persistently strained. The trouble here had started with the murder of a Russian official envoy while on Swiss territory soon after the Bolshevik revolution, and for long Russia urged its unwillingness to allow its delegates to enter Switzerland as a reason for abstaining from participation in the League of Nations. This difficulty was overcome, but Switzerland continued to refuse recognition of the Bolshevik Government, a bill for the establishment of diplomatic relations being defeated even as late as 1936. In the same year an attempt was made to suppress the Communist party without a

referendum, under the "urgency" clause of the Constitution, but the majority in Parliament declined to adopt this measure.

Some slight modifications of the Constitution were made during the years after the war. The Federal Government was given control of traffic on the high roads by an Act of 1922—up to this time some cantons had totally prohibited motor-vehicles; in 1930 a Federal Criminal Code superseded the separate cantonal codes; among the cantons the ancient assembly of citizens in Uri gave place to an elected council in 1928, whilst the two half-cantons of Basle decided to unite in 1936. Referendum and initiative were in frequent use, and it was remarkable that in 1936 there were no federal referenda. Among other proposals of interest were the abortive scheme for a state corn monopoly in 1926, a great contributory pension scheme open to all, with contributions by employers and employees, defeated on referendum in 1931—probably owing to the economic crisis, a restriction of freights on motor-lorries in the interests of the railroads, rejected in 1935, and a capital levy, rejected in 1922 by a six to one majority. Switzerland remained on the gold standard until 1936, when the currency was devalued by 30 per cent.

ITALY

The Italian delegates entered the peace conference of Paris as representatives of one of the "Big Five" that were to control the coming settlement; a few months later they walked out of the conference protesting at being treated like a minor Balkan state. The trouble had arisen over the Adriatic coasts. Before Italy agreed to enter the war on the side of the Allies she had taken the precaution of obtaining a definite treaty promising the transference to Italian rule of the territories which she coveted. Now, while confirming the cession to Italy of Trieste and the Trentino, the Allies wanted to reserve large stretches of the Adriatic coast which had already been promised to Italy for the new Jugoslav kingdom. The Italian Parliament approved the action of its delegates in leaving the conference by a majority of 382 to 40, and patriotic demonstrations were held in the Italian cities. Numerous streets had been renamed a short time before in honour of President Wilson; the name of Wilson was now obliterated from

the nomenclature of Italian highways. Yet all this had no effect on the attitude of the other Allies, and in the final treaty the Italian claims to Fiume and Dalmatia were passed over. Orlando, the Prime Minister, who had received so hearty a welcome in April, was defeated in Parliament in June for his failure to obtain better terms, and his place was taken by Nitti, while Tittoni succeeded Baron Sonnino as Foreign Minister.

One part of the area in dispute was, however, to be eventually secured for Italy. When Cavour was afraid to defy the Powers by deposing the independent King of Naples in 1860, he sent Garibaldi and his redshirts to do the job for him, issuing a formal order to stop the wicked fellow from embarking. In 1919 the poet Gabriele d'Annunzio played the part of Garibaldi to Nitti's Cavour, and a legion of volunteers and "mutinied" Italian troops marched into Fiume, whilst the Government imposed a "blockade" on the harbour that had been seized by the insubordinate enthusiasts. Neither Jugoslavia nor the Allies generally felt inclined to embark on a war to turn d'Annunzio out, and after long negotiations Italy secured from Jugoslavia the Treaty of Rapallo, in November 1920, by which Italy obtained the port of Zara and some Dalmatian islands, whilst Fiume was to be an independent republic. The Giolitti Government accepted this compromise in good faith, and when d'Annunzio refused to accept any terms less than annexation General Caviglia was sent to turn him out of the town, which he did in January after a brief resistance.

The politics of the Republic of Fiume were stormy. Racial ill-feeling remained acute in this town of 50,000 inhabitants and in the surrounding villages. Occasionally there were riots, and there was a constant agitation on the part of the Italian section of the community for union with Italy. Eventually, in 1924, a second treaty with Jugoslavia arranged for the peaceful cession of the town to Italy, with guarantees regarding Jugoslav transit trade at the port, whilst the suburb of Barosh was ceded to Jugoslavia.

Italy, though a large and a populous country, was a poor one when compared with the other members of the "Big Five". The war left it exhausted and in financial distress. The cost of living had risen considerably, and wages had not by any means kept pace with this rise; heavy taxation had been levied, and there was a drain on current finances owing to the large loans taken up in America and elsewhere. Under these circumstances there was

much popular discontent, which could not be relieved merely by demonstrations against Jugoslavia and President Wilson. Both in town and in country there were riots and disturbances, usually of a Socialist or Communist nature. Even during the war Communism had made great headway among the masses, who were much impressed by the Russian revolution, and it had been Communist unwillingness to fight for a capitalist Government that was the chief factor in the rout of the Italian army at Caporetto in 1917. The upheavals which followed the war were similar at base to those which distracted Great Britain during these years, but they were conducted with more violence.

The Governments that had the handling of this difficult situation were conspicuous less for their corruption or general inefficiency than for their weakness. Italian democracy had never been a pronounced success; the electorate, particularly in the rural provinces, had been ignorant and amenable to both bribery and coercion. Parliament had been an arena in which a leisured class had played the game of politics, the traditional division into Liberal and Conservative masking a series of personal and group activities. Good Catholics never voted at all, for an old ban of the Papacy had subjected the Italian Parliament to boycott until the Papal States should be restored to the Vicar of Christ. After the war the Pope allowed the formation of a Catholic party which called itself the "Popular Party", for the Socialist and Communist movements were beginning to threaten the Church. The "spoils system" was rampant in political life, and the civil service had become bloated with supernumeraries for whom jobs had to be found after successful elections. The Italian Parliament has been said to have been an alien ingraftation, with the accent strongly on the "graft". The group-movements within the two great parties were constantly causing reconstructions of the Cabinet, and in the forty-six years between 1876 and 1922 there were thirty-two Ministries.

Idealism was represented by two schools of thought, which afterwards crystallised into the militant bands that fought out their quarrels under Giolitti's last Government. The Socialist party, founded by Turati in 1892, at first met with severe repression; then it became recognised as a regular Italian party, and in 1900 some thirty Socialists were returned to the Lower House. The parliamentary Socialists adhered to their idealism sufficiently

to refuse to enter group-coalitions with the other parties in order to get into office, though during the war this rule was somewhat relaxed in order to encourage national unity in the war with the Kaisers. Bissolati, who was the Socialist member of the Cabinet in 1918, resigned office rather than support the imperialist aims of Orlando and Sonnino at the Paris conference. The Socialist party, however, was weakened by furious internal quarrels, in one of which Benito Mussolini was expelled from the party in 1914. The other idealist party was nationalist and expansionist, aiming particularly at the liberation of *Italia irredenta* from the Habsburg yoke. Under the leadership of Corradini, this group founded a Nationalist Association in 1910; the glorification of the State as against both organised labour and the private capitalist in the propaganda of this party foreshadowed the Fascist ideals.

Universal male suffrage had been introduced in 1913; hitherto less than 10 per cent. of the population had been electors. Proportional representation was introduced in 1919, and the vote was extended to women in 1920. These changes made little difference to parliamentary life, and in spite of the participation of the Catholic Church in electioneering for the Popular Party, only 57 per cent of the electorate voted at the general election of 1921. There were masses of Italians who regarded national affairs as outside the interests of a life that was still strongly provincial. At the close of the war it had struck Mussolini as remarkable when he heard a soldier talk of going home to "Italy" instead of to his native district. The old Liberal and Conservative groups still dominated Parliament, though the Socialists increased their representation to nearly a third of the Lower House in 1919, and retained 120 seats out of 525 in 1920, whilst in the latter election there were a dozen independent Communists returned. Nitti retained the premiership till 1920, when he gave place to Giolitti, the veteran "Liberal" leader. A quarrel within the dominant faction led to Giolitti's resignation in 1921, and Bonomi became Prime Minister, being in turn replaced by Facta in 1922.

While the politicians continued to play the party game and to devise means to keep the people quiet, distress and disorder increased. Prices remained high, wages were low, trade was bad, unemployment increasing, whilst the restrictions now being placed on immigration by the United States stopped up an

economic safety-valve which in pre-war days had relieved Italy of tens of thousands of people every year. The employers said that higher wages would merely increase unemployment, for only by low costs of labour could Italy compete successfully with countries whose industry was better equipped. In spite of high taxes the Budgets showed a series of deficits, which were met by fresh borrowings. During the war the price of bread had been kept down by means of a Government subsidy; this was withdrawn in 1921, and more trouble was caused. Strikes and riots spread to every province; revolution was openly preached.

Under the timid and vacillating Governments at Rome, organised disorder made great headway. Under the eyes of the rulers of Italy a revolution was being prepared. In 1920 there occurred the famous incident of the seizure of the factories. All over the Lombard plain the workmen seized possession of the metal-works and proceeded to run them as their own businesses, ousting the employers and managers and in some cases committing horrible outrages on their opponents. The Giolitti Government, though feeling no sympathy towards the insurgents, was afraid to use force against them; it not only allowed the men to continue their experiment, it even secured a vote of parliamentary approval for the establishment of "workers' control in industry". The business side of the revolutionised factories soon became a chaotic failure, and after a few months the men decided to return to work under their old employers, though they succeeded in raising the level of their wages. Had the revolutionaries been able to strike a vigorous blow at Rome during this period, it is probable that the whole system of government would have collapsed, for the police and the troops were everywhere being blatantly insulted by riotous mobs without being allowed to hit back by a Government that saw safety only in avoiding further provocation of its enemies. But the Socialists were hopelessly divided into jarring groups; there was little beyond local organisation among the rioters, and there were no military leaders to head a Socialist march on Rome. In the following year the Socialist party split into three sections; the "Maximalists" demanded violent revolution, the Constitutionalists urged reliance on parliamentary elections, and a third group went over to the Moscow Communists.

The Nationalist group developed on far different lines. Here we find party unity and co-operation, excellent organisation on a

national scale and good military leadership. The spread of militant Socialism and Communism provoked this party into renewed activity, and it was as a safeguard against the excesses of the other revolutionaries that Nationalism gained the bulk of its post-war supporters. The leading spirit in this regeneration of the old Nationalists was Benito Mussolini, one of those giants of energy and organising capacity who, once they become absorbed in politics, live politics for twenty-four hours of the day. Of humble origin, Mussolini joined the Socialist movement when quite young, and had gone into exile in Switzerland as the result of an order for his arrest. Returning to Italy shortly before the war, he urged the Socialist party to support the cause of the Allies against the Kaiserdoms of central Europe. The Italian Socialists were for neutrality, and after some stormy arguments they expelled Mussolini from the party. He forthwith launched a newspaper, "The People of Italy", which continued to advocate war on the rulers of *Italia irredenta* until its policy happened to be adopted by the Government, when Mussolini was called up for the army. Accidentally injured during the Carso campaign, he returned to his journalism, and was one of the leading supporters of d'Annunzio in his fight for Fiume. Though out of favour with the majority of official Socialists, Mussolini had not abandoned his devotion to Socialist principles, which he instilled into his readers. With an eye to future political development, he organised a system of ex-service men's clubs or *Fasci*, the first one being inaugurated in March 1919.

So far Mussolini had not declared war upon the other left-wing groups. He hoped to reunite the Socialist party and to induce it to shed its anti-nationalist ideas. Benito Mussolini, with his combination of Socialist principles and sturdy patriotism, was the founder of the original brand of "National Socialism". His programme in 1919 called for a republic, a single-chamber parliament and the referendum. The trade unions were to control industry and the peasantry were to be put in possession of the land. The banks were to be nationalised; all joint-stock companies must be dissolved; the stock exchange was no longer to be tolerated. The national debt could and should be paid off by heavy taxation of the rich. The power of the Church was to be reduced. In 1920 he offered help to the workmen who had seized the Lombard factories, but was snubbed. By the end of that year he had begun

to arm his supporters in the *fascii* as the result of frequent fights with Communists.

The year 1921 saw a rapid development of what now came to be called—from the “Clubs” which formed the party nucleus—*Fascismo*. The movement received a great impetus and considerable armed support from d’Annunzio’s men returning from Fiume. Fights between Fascists and Communists became events of almost daily occurrence in every large town, and it was noticeable that where the police and the troops seemed paralysed by the timid policy of the Government, Fascists restored order by hard hitting. Losing all faith in the Government, the propertied classes turned to Fascism as salvation from revolution: thousands of shopkeepers and small landowners sent subscriptions to the party; the black shirt—the distinctive mark of the party—became the symbol of protection from the excesses of Bolshevism. The Bonomi Government, unwilling to restore order itself, tried to prevent the Fascists doing so, and issued orders for their disarming, but the parliamentary leaders were as afraid to lay hands on the blackshirts as they were of striking at the Communists, and the armed *Squadre* remained in being.

In May there was a general election, and owing to the system of proportional representation just introduced, the Fascists were able to return a group of representatives to Parliament. Twenty blackshirts thus reached the National Assembly, and a dozen more members were active supporters of the movement. In November a national Fascist Congress was held, at which great enthusiasm was shown; the affair presented a great contrast to the Socialist party meetings, which were distracted with sectional quarrels. Mussolini had already inspired so much confidence in his followers that this Congress voted him a free hand to dictate the policy of the Fascist party.

From this moment Fascism made rapid strides. Meetings were held, propaganda was intensified, and many Communist town councils were forcibly ejected by the *Squadre*. Mussolini now made advances to the wealthy factory-owners with the idea of obtaining more financial backing for his plans; they met him more than half-way, and in return he introduced considerable modifications into his programme. In September he issued a proclamation in the name of the Fascist party recognising the monarchy and the Catholic Church. Then he called another

Congress of the party to meet at Naples on 24 October; 40,000 blackshirts were brought together at this assembly. He judged that the time was ripe to effect his revolution. Two days after the blackshirts assembled at Naples there appeared a manifesto declaring that the Fascist party had decided to march on the capital to hand over a purified country to its King and its soldiers. The blackshirts moved northwards.

The Government wavered between surrender and defence. Facta, the Prime Minister, talked of resigning; then he drew up a decree of martial law. Reports from the barracks suggested that the troops could not be relied upon to defend the existing Government by shooting Fascists. King Victor Emmanuel refused to sign the decree of martial law. Then, on the advice of several parliamentary leaders, Facta invited Mussolini to discuss the idea of a coalition Government. On October 30 Mussolini arrived in Rome by train and went to meet Facta. Next day it was announced that Facta had resigned and that Benito Mussolini was Prime Minister of Italy, with a Cabinet which included Fascists, Conservatives, and members of several other parliamentary parties. But Mussolini, whilst willing to work with some of the old personnel of Parliament, would have no compromise with the old system. Within a fortnight he made it clear that if the new Cabinet were to remain in being it must accept Fascist principles and take power to reorganise the country without reference to Parliament. On 16 November Parliament was given the alternative of voting a temporary dictatorship or being dissolved. A week later it granted full powers to the Cabinet, from which those who were unwilling to follow the Fascist party were dismissed; the dictatorship was limited to the ensuing twelvemonth. The critical resolution was passed by 275 votes to 90.

Benito Mussolini was thirty-nine years of age when he became Prime Minister of Italy. He stands out as the most forceful personality among the numerous dictators whom the troubles of the post-war years brought to the front. To enthusiasm, tenacity and a capacity for prodigious work he was able to add considerable oratorical talent and a wide knowledge of all types of men. An idealist, he was yet supremely conscious of realities, and his rule was marked from the outset by that capacity to compromise with deep-seated traditions that led his left-wing opponents to accuse him of being a reactionary Conservative in disguise. The nation

generally accepted his rule with a good heart, and the assiduous propaganda which covered the country with his portraits was assisted by a genuine enthusiasm for a man who secured the achievement of such spectacular results. Few Italians outside the narrow circle of the old party politicians were prepared to make any sacrifices for the former regime, which had left Italy economically poor and backward, burdened with high taxes, huge debts and unbalanced budgets, and suffering from an inferiority complex in her relations with the other Powers. The fall of the old regime, however, was due above all else to its failure to defend itself. The first and essential faculty of a Government is to govern; the question of the lines on which it is going to govern comes afterwards. The fatuous way in which the parliamentary Ministries looked on while local gangs of insurgents, Fascist and Communist, violated the law, murdered their opponents and indulged in civil war under the very eyes of the police simply invited revolutionaries to overthrow them. Had there been no Fascism, it is highly probable that Italy would have become a Soviet state. As it happened, the more conservative elements, finding the Government unwilling to protect them, organised their own defence, and eventually finished the job off by ousting the *rois fainéants* of the Chamber of Deputies and taking the national administration into their own hands. The Fascists calculated rightly that a Government that could not bring itself to smash Bolshevism would be no serious opponent of their own illegal activities, just as the Ulstermen of "King Carson's army" defied the regime that allowed the I.R.A. and Sinn Fein to flaunt their uniforms and their flags before the eyes of a Government that had ceased to govern.

The first task of the new Government was to secure its position. Italian provincial life had been dominated politically by the powerful Prefects appointed on the "spoils system" from among party politicians. There was a comprehensive revision of the list of Prefects, blackshirts or men of strong Fascist sympathies being installed in the provincial administration. There was also a wholesale "purging" of municipal councils, sometimes accompanied by violence towards the opponents of Fascism. A strict censorship of the Press was established. On the whole, the establishment of the new regime was carried out with few excesses. There were some cases of murder, particularly in Turin at the end of 1922,

but where violence was shown to opponents it was more often of a minor and even of a grimly humorous kind; a favourite trick was to forcibly administer huge doses of castor oil to outspoken opponents of the new Government. A new electoral law of 1923 awarded two-thirds of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies to the party that polled the largest number of votes, provided that its total reached a quarter of the votes cast. The remaining third of the seats were distributed among the other parties in accordance with the principles of Proportional Representation. No doubt was felt that Fascism would obtain 25 per cent of the votes at the coming election, nor that it would return as the largest party. This Reform Bill was submitted for the approval of Parliament; it passed the Lower House by a majority of 100 and the Senate by one of 120. Finally a "National Militia" was organised, the membership being carefully restricted to the supporters of Fascism.

The exceptional powers conferred on the Government expired at the end of 1923, and provision was made for a general election under the new system in 1924. During the year 1923 the Catholic "Populars" had withdrawn their support from the Government, and their representatives had resigned from the Cabinet, but Pope Pius XI—who had succeeded Benedict XV in 1922—advised support of the Fascists and condemned the action of Don Sturzo, the "Popular" leader. The result of the 1924 election did not show one of those incredibly overwhelming victories which characterised similar "appeals to the people" by some other post-war dictatorships. About two-thirds of the electorate voted; of these 60 per cent voted Fascist, 15 per cent supported the Socialist party, and the Populars polled 10 per cent, most of the remaining votes going to the old Liberal groups. The election was characterised by a good deal of violence, outrages and murders being committed on both sides.

One crime, committed just after the election, created a sensation which extended all over the world, for it was alleged to have been carried out under the direct orders of the Government. This was the murder of Matteotti, one of the Socialists returned to the new House, who was hustled into a car in a Roman street, driven into the suburbs and killed. It was said that Matteotti had possessed himself of information which would disclose corruption and jobbery in the Fascist Government. Two persons who were

arrested in connection with the crime declared that they had been instigated by high Fascist officials. The Government professed a desire to have the fullest investigation, and a Commission was set up to examine evidence. The result was a somewhat mild censure of General de Bono, the chief of police in Rome, for having failed either to prevent the crime or to elucidate the mystery; de Bono had already handed in his resignation. The opponents of the regime, however, continued to believe in the guilt of the Government as a whole, and much political capital was made in foreign countries out of the affair. Orlando and Giolitti, who had hitherto continued to attend Parliament, withdrew into private life on account of these proceedings, and Liberal members also withdrew their attendance. Numerous arrests of political opponents of the regime were made, and the censorship of the Press was tightened. In 1926 there at last took place the trial of four persons who were accused of murdering Matteotti: two were sent to prison for six years, the other two were released.

The Government proceeded steadily to tighten its control over the country. In 1925 the great majority of the municipal councils were placed under the direct control of centrally appointed officials, only 500 towns out of more than 7000 being left free from this supervision. The State-appointed Prefects were now made *ex-officio* Chairmen of the Provincial Councils. In the same year a new Constitution was approved by Parliament: single-member constituencies were restored; the vote was restricted to males who were either members of trade and professional organisations, direct taxpayers, or priests; the Senate was to consist of life-peers nominated by the Crown, with the addition of the royal Princes. The most striking change, however, was in the conversion of the premiership into a recognised dictatorship: the "Head of the State" was given the powers of the old Irish Poynings' Law over Parliament—no subject could be discussed without the permission of the dictator, who was further protected by an extension of the law of treason to cover plots against his life. The Head of the State was henceforward to be appointed directly by the Crown, without reference to Parliament or Ministry.

The passing of these measures through Parliament was made easier by the action of a large section of the Opposition, which for long refused to attend the meetings as a protest against the

Matteotti affair. In memory of the ancient Roman "secession to the Aventine Hill" this group was called the "Aventine party". Most of them were absent until 1926, and when they returned they were flung out of the House by the Fascist members; shortly afterwards the majority declared the Aventine members to have forfeited their seats through dereliction of duty. At the same time all the Opposition newspapers were suppressed and some five hundred political arrests were made.

The final revision of the Constitution was made in 1928, when the democratic element was reduced to a minimum. The central point of this new Constitution was the Fascist Grand Council—a party organisation mainly nominated by the dictator—which was now recognised as part of the national machinery of government. The whole country became one great constituency; the thirteen great industrial and professional corporations which were in process of establishment were to nominate a total of 1000 candidates, the lists being sent in to the Fascist Grand Council, which was given the power to veto nominations and to add names to the list. The complete list of 400 candidates as finally approved by the Fascist Grand Council was then to be submitted to a plebiscite. If the national poll approved the list, the Parliament was constituted; should the verdict of the electorate be hostile, the process of nomination was to begin again on the same lines as before, the power of the electorate being reduced merely to the right to reject each successive Government list. All constitutional amendments must first receive the approval of the Fascist Grand Council, which also was to submit to the Head of the State candidates for the Ministry. The Head of the State had absolute control over the agenda of the Grand Council. In local government all municipal councils were abolished, government officials taking their place. In justifying the last-named change Mussolini quoted the administrative powers of the English Justices of the Peace as a precedent! As a concession to local opinion, the *Podestà* or Governor of each town was to be assisted by an *advisory* council nominated by the Crown and sitting behind closed doors.

Naturally one of the chief problems which faced the Fascist Government was the reorganisation and development of Italian industry. Whilst insisting on the paramount importance of State control, the party regarded private enterprise as a natural method of development, based on strong human instincts and fortified

by long tradition. It was noteworthy that in 1923 the State railways, the parcel post service and the telephones were all handed over to private enterprise. The industrial war between capital and labour was to be discouraged by subordinating both sides to the interests of the State. The old trade unions were not forbidden, but alongside of them there were created new Fascist unions, membership of which was made compulsory. The old unions naturally withered away when workmen had to pay two separate subscriptions if they wished to retain membership of their old organisations, and the process was accelerated by limiting official recognition in arbitration cases to the new unions. A law of 1926 declared both strikes and lock-outs illegal and imposed severe penalties for such interruptions of production: all labour disputes were to be settled by the law courts. In the following year, 1927, the Government issued what was known as the "Labour Charter", which envisaged the whole of Italian industry organised in a series of great Corporations. In each industry the organisations of the employers and of labour were to elect delegates to a joint council equally representative of the two sides, and this joint body was to control conditions in the whole industry, subject to the intervention of the State if necessary. Collective bargaining on wages and hours was recognised, and the officials of the Corporation were to see that both sides adhered to the bargains thus struck. It was intended that these Corporations, like the mediaeval guilds, should concern themselves with the general progress of the industries as well as with labour conditions. To supervise the whole system, a Minister of Corporations was appointed, Mussolini himself taking the office. There was no hurry to complete the organisation of the Corporations; the task was undertaken systematically and thoroughly, under the dictator's personal supervision, and the complete scheme was not ready to put into operation until the year 1934.

A less urgent but very important problem was that of the Church. Fascism recognised supernatural religion as an elementary human need, and the Roman Catholic Church as the traditional channel through which Italians could satisfy this need. The activities of the Church, however, must be kept subordinate to the general interests, spiritual and temporal, of the State, and anything resembling an *imperium in imperio* would not be tolerated. Like Napoleon in his reconstruction of France more than a cen-

tury before, Mussolini negotiated a Concordat with the Papacy, the agreement being signed in 1929. Roman Catholicism was recognised as the State religion of Italy, and religious teaching was to be recognised in the national schools. The Italian State made a large money-payment to the Pope. The Church in return abjured any intention of meddling with temporal politics, whilst the Church youth-organisations, which competed with the Fascist *Balilla*, were to be dissolved. This Concordat brought to an end the curious legacy of the seizure of Rome in 1870, the voluntary seclusion of the Popes in their palace. Pius IX had refused to set foot in the city which had been torn from his temporal rule by General Raphael Cadorna, and succeeding Popes had observed the same custom of self-imprisonment in the Vatican. The Concordat recognised the rule of the Italian kingdom over the bulk of the city of Rome, whilst the Vatican palace and its environs was recognised as a separate state under the temporal rule of the Pope.

As in the case of Napoleon, the Concordat did not work particularly well. The main source of trouble was in the youth-organisations. Though the Church dissolved its Boy Scouts, it retained and extended certain social clubs which went by the name of "Catholic Action". The Government held that these clubs were prohibited by the terms of the Concordat, and accused them in addition of fostering political activities. There was also conflict over some of the Catholic newspapers, which were suppressed for printing political articles. The tension culminated in 1931, when there were fights between Fascists and members of "Catholic Action", and the clubs were closed by the police. Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical denouncing the Government of Italy in scathing terms, accusing it of "sabring the laws of God and the Church" and of encouraging "a veritable pagan State-worship". He then struck a further blow at Fascism by releasing Catholics from their obligation to observe any oath they might take to the Fascist party. After this climax there was a marked *rapprochement* from both sides, and by the end of the year a supplementary agreement had been come to, by which the Church specifically excluded political activities from its clubs, suppressed the athletic functions of "Catholic Action" as likely to compete with those of the *Balilla*, and consented to abandon the practice of hoisting Papal flags alongside those of Italy over its institutions;

it was also agreed that no specifically Catholic trade unions should be formed.

After five years of dictatorship, Mussolini in 1927 declared that the revolutionary period of Fascism was over and called upon his followers to use peaceful methods towards their opponents. In 1929 was held the first general election under the new Constitution of 1928. Though the system of Corporations was not yet fully organised, sufficient had been done to enable a Chamber of Corporations to get together the list of suggested candidates. The Fascist Grand Council chose its 400 from this list, and a plebiscite was taken on its acceptance. Ninety per cent of the electorate registered their votes; only 2 per cent of these voted against acceptance. At the election held five years later the Opposition polled 16,000 votes against the Fascist ten million, 96 per cent of the electorate having voted.

In 1932 Italy celebrated the tenth anniversary of the Fascist revolution, and was able to look back on a period of vast and comprehensive reconstruction. Not only had the industrial world been completely reorganised, and the Corporations scheme brought towards its final stages; every section of national activity had received some stimulus from the most active Government Italy had ever possessed. The banks had been reorganised, and a system of loans to industry initiated through the *Istituto Mobiliare*, which was controlled by the Minister of Finance. The lira had been stabilised in 1927, without a departure from the gold standard. The chronic budget deficits were choked, and in 1926 there was a surplus. A gigantic campaign for making Italy self-supporting in cereals had been launched in 1925—the “battle of the grain”—State subsidies had been granted to farmers, cheap fertilisers distributed, lectures on modern agricultural methods delivered by the thousand. By 1932 this campaign had brought grain-production somewhere near the requirements of national self-sufficiency. Waste land had been reclaimed in many parts of the country; marshes had been effectively drained in Sicily, in Sardinia, in the Basilicata; and the erstwhile malaria-ridden Pontine Marshes to the south of Rome were now a prosperous agricultural region centring round the new town of Littoria, which was soon to possess 20,000 inhabitants. A network of new “Roman roads” traversed Italy, and for the first time since the days of ancient Rome Calabria and Sicily possessed first-class

highways. Large portions of the capital had been rebuilt on a magnificent scale. The railway service between Florence and Naples, through Rome, had been electrified. There was little of the *dolce far niente* about Italian life under Fascism.

Not least among the problems of the dictatorship was the organisation and consolidation of the Fascist party after its triumph of 1922. Like the Bolshevik leaders in Russia, the Italian Fascist organisers resolved to maintain a high standard of quality in the membership. The party experienced periodical "purges" in which unsatisfactory members were expelled. In 1927 thirty thousand expulsions took place, and at the same time new admissions were stopped except as regards the rising generation. A more thorough purge took place in 1931, when some 150,000 were expelled. At the close of the first decade of Fascist rule, in 1932, the general registers were opened for a few months, and a fair number of adults were admitted; then the registers were closed again, except for the young. Out of a population of forty million, there were never more than two million members of the party. The Fascist Grand Council, the central party organ, was established in 1923; the reconstruction of 1928 enabled the dictator to nominate the majority of the members, certain officials being added: its numbers were reduced from 56 to 23 in 1929. The General Secretary of the Fascist party was nominated by the Crown on the advice of the Head of the State from 1929 onwards; local secretaries were to be nominated by the Head of the State on the advice of the Grand Council. A smaller committee of the Grand Council, called the Directory, was appointed by the Head of the State from a list submitted by the Council. The first years of the party were remarkable for the ubiquitous domination of Mussolini, who not only controlled all important party business but took into his own hands most of the important Cabinet Ministries. At the beginning of 1929 he had become the "Pooh-Bah" of Italy, holding no less than nine Ministries, seven of which he resigned during that year.

A strong feature of the Fascist organisation was its concentration on the rising generation. Italian children were encouraged to join the *Balilla*—the Fascist Scouts, named after a boy hero of the Genoese struggle with the Austrians in the eighteenth century—at the age of eight. At fourteen they passed, if satisfactory, into the *Avanguardisti*—the "Advance Guard"—and at eighteen into

the "Young Fascists". Only at the age of twenty-one could they be admitted into the party as full members. To this series of youth-organisations there was added, in 1934, the Wolf-cubs, whose elementary exercises in soldiering at the early age of six raised the ridicule and indignation of foreign critics. Another remarkable development was the organisation known as *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro*, or "National organisation of leisure", which performed much useful work in providing educational cinemas, travelling theatres, and facilities for cheap tours within the country. Popular enthusiasm for the national regeneration, as represented by the Fascist movement, was also stimulated by a succession of festivals and anniversary commemorations on a large scale.

Fascism started with no clear-cut principles, still less with a body of dogma. It certainly stood for national patriotism and against Communism and internationalism. As time went on its literary men tried to formulate a creed of Fascism, although the essential characteristic of the movement had been its capacity to adopt deep-seated national ideas and to adjust its policy to circumstances. Its central idea was the supremacy of the State, of which all citizens were members, but the State was national and comprehensive of all classes, as opposed to the Bolshevik State, which was regarded as only part of an international organisation of the proletariat. The subjection of the individual to communal interests was emphasised at every turn, though the Fascists preferred the words "Corporation" and "Corporative" to express a system that was so strongly opposed to the usual forms of Socialism and Communism. Fascism recognised the monarchy, the Church, and private enterprise in industry, though all three institutions must be strictly controlled in the general interests of the Corporative State. Unlike the Bolsheviks, the Fascists were opposed to the "emancipation of women": their wish to see woman relegated to her traditional place in the home linked up with their desire to see a further expansion of the Italian race. Large families were encouraged, special favour being shown to their fathers in the allotment of well-paid jobs. Bachelors were subjected to a special tax, which was doubled in 1928. Finally, Fascism advocated military strength to assert the rights and claims of Italy against foreign powers, and looked to the possibility of building an empire overseas.

The first task of the second decade of Fascist rule was to complete the structure of the great industrial Corporations. The original scheme was for a double organisation of masters and men in six great industrial groups, with a thirteenth Corporation for the professional classes. In its final shape the scheme embraced twenty-two Corporations, each representative of a separate branch of economic activity. Within each Corporation were "Federations" which in turn were subdivided into branches. For the Council of each Corporation the Federations submitted a list of nominees to the Minister of Corporations—Mussolini—who selected from it the members of the Corporation Council, which averaged about fifty members. The system received its official form by a law approved by Parliament in 1934.

Italy was not all flag-waving and enthusiasm under the Fascist rule. There was an appreciable minority that followed the traditional ideas of Socialism and Liberalism and resented the new dictatorship. In the early years of the regime more than 10,000 persons were exiled from Italy, 2000 being forcibly deported. In addition there were at one time more than 5000 political prisoners in jails and concentration camps. After Mussolini's "normal times" speech of 1927 the persecution slackened considerably, but arrests and punishments were still frequent. It was remarkable that in 1934 there were no political death-sentences, though there were trials of malcontent groups in Milan and in Turin. Rome was not built in a day, and it took more than a change of Government, however spectacular, to convert a poverty-stricken country like Italy into a garden of prosperity. The great world slump of 1931 hit Italy very hard, particularly as Mussolini refused to lower the prestige of the country by departing from the gold standard. Prices were high compared with wages, whilst high tariffs either kept out or rendered unattainable many articles that were in other countries within reach of the poorer classes. In spite of the victorious "battle of the grain" the price of bread was high, so high that many people were eating maize and potatoes instead. There was also a high rate of unemployment, even in agriculture. There was naturally much discontent, though the strict censorship of the Press prevented the broadcasting of grievances. The Government had started some social services, extending education and making medical attention more available to the masses, but Italy lagged well behind the other western countries in this

respect. In 1931, 20 per cent of those over the age of six were registered as illiterate. Nor was there any "dole" for the unemployed. Foreign capitalists were nervous about Italian securities, and in 1934 there was a run on gold which led to an embargo on its export. Yet Italian capital still had confidence in its Government; the Conversion Loan of the same year, reducing interest on national debt from 5 to 4 per cent, was subscribed twice over.

As might have been expected, the provision of relief to the distressed population was not left without organisation. A forty-hour week was proclaimed in industry, to enable more hands to be taken on, though wages were correspondingly reduced. Agricultural wages in kind instead of in money were authorised. New restrictions were imposed on the employment of women and children in industry. At the same time, like most other Governments, the Fascist rulers of Italy imposed severe economy cuts, reducing the salaries of civil servants by sums ranging between 6 and 12 per cent. Landlords were also forced to reduce rents by at least 12 per cent. The exigencies of the economic crisis and the Abyssinian war of 1935 led to the establishment of State control of the banks and of credit, as also of all trading in wheat. At long last the Government devalued the lira in 1936, enabling it to arrange a general rise of 10 per cent in wages. The forty-hour week was, however, maintained. A disguised capital levy in the shape of a forced loan of 5 per cent of the value of fixed property added to the resources of the Government. To regulate and stimulate foreign trade the whole Italian mercantile marine was organised under four big companies under the control of the State in 1936.

Fascist foreign policy was directed to asserting, firstly, the dignity of Italy as a Great Power, and, secondly, the extension of the overseas possessions. There is no doubt that the economic progress of the country, coupled with the militarisation of the whole people, gave Italy a far better standing in the councils of Europe. The Corfu incident of 1923 was the first opportunity of displaying self-assertion abroad, and Italy enjoyed it to the full. Extravagant terms were demanded of Greece in compensation for the murder of a party of Italians by Greek brigands, and when the full demands were rejected the Italian fleet bombarded the port of Corfu. Such an act of aggression was contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The League, however, showed no great desire to follow up its protest by attempting to penalise Italy, and took advantage of Greece's willingness to refer the matter to the Conference of Ambassadors of the ex-Allied Powers to wash its hands of an unpleasant business. The Hague Court, to whom the compensation claims were referred, decided in favour of Italy, but this did not excuse the recourse to military invasion of Greek territory. The precedent of 1923 was remembered by Italy when she decided to launch a much bigger invasion of foreign territory in 1935.

In Europe, Italy's interests were concerned mainly with strengthening her position on the other side of the Adriatic and with preventing the restoration of a strong and united state in the lands of the old Habsburg monarchy. The little state of Albania remained after the Great War entirely subject to Italian economic control, whilst as a counterblast to the ill-feeling displayed by Jugoslavia over the loss of Fiume friendly relations were cultivated with Bulgaria. The presence of a large German minority in the Trentino caused tension with Austria, and on more than one occasion Mussolini checked anti-Italian propaganda at Vienna by vigorous sabre-rattling, whilst Italy made it clear that no restoration of the Habsburgs would be tolerated. The establishment of the Nazi regime in Germany, with its threats of absorbing Austria, alarmed Italy considerably. For some time the two Powers were working against each other in the Danubian states by encouraging and assisting local parties that called themselves Nazis and Fascists respectively. When the Austrian Nazis murdered Chancellor Dollfuss in 1934, Italy mobilised on the Trentino frontier to save Austria from a Nazi revolution, and during the same year pacts of friendship were successfully negotiated with both Austria and Hungary. Another effect of the Hitlerite regime was to bring Italy and France closer together; hitherto their relations had not been very cordial, for France rather resented the militarist up-start on her south-eastern frontier. In January 1935 a treaty between France and Italy settled all outstanding disputes, and proved of great use to Mussolini in the Abyssinian upheaval later in the year.

Italy had started rather late in the scramble for colonies, and had been left with the less attractive scraps of the African continent. A couple of coast-strips on each side of the Somali peninsula had been supplemented by a sandy area round Tripoli as a result

of the Turkish war of 1911. All told, the population of the Italian colonial empire barely exceeded a couple of millions. An attempt to conquer Abyssinia, one of the two remaining African states that were not ruled by European Powers, had been frustrated by the disaster of Adowa in 1896, when an Italian army was destroyed among the mountains. Mussolini began his period of rule by ordering for the first time an effective occupation of the Tripolitanian coast, the Italians having hitherto confined themselves to a small strip round the city of Tripoli. Bengasi was now made the capital of a new province of Cyrenaica. In the following year, 1924, a treaty with Great Britain adjusted the frontier of Italian Somaliland in favour of Italy, Jubaland being added to the Italian dominions. In 1931 a minor success was gained by the conquest of the Senussi of the Libyan desert; after a campaign directed by Marshal Badoglio and General Graziani, the warlike chief Omar el Mukhtar was captured and publicly hanged. The boundary between Libya and Egypt was delimited by a treaty of 1934; the frontier with the French possessions by one of 1935, by which Italy gained a slight accession of territory.

The chief colonial trouble now came from the direction of Abyssinia. This country, though nominally a single kingdom, was actually a loose federation of mountain tribes in a very backward state of civilisation. Occasionally some of these tribes would raid across the frontiers, carrying back with them quantities of plunder and captured natives of the surrounding territories. These natives were known to be sold as slaves, for Abyssinia was one of the parts of the world where slavery still persisted. Sometimes it was the British administration in the Sudan that had to deal with these noxious raiders; sometimes it was the Italian administration in Eritrea or Somalia. In addition to this cause of friction, there was also an undefined boundary on the south of Abyssinia, where a series of "incidents" took place in which Ethiopian troops came into conflict with Italian detachments. Neither the three-power treaty of 1906, in which Britain, France and Italy took part, nor a separate Italo-Abyssinian treaty of 1928 succeeded in stopping these frequent little disputes. Towards the end of 1934 a more serious *fracas* than usual, at Wal-Wal, in the Somali boundary area, led to a miniature battle in which 60 Italians and 200 Abyssinians were killed. It was this incident that was the immediate cause of the Abyssinian war.

Italy demanded compensation, throwing the whole blame for the Wal-Wal affair on the Ethiopians. The Emperor of Abyssinia, Haile Selassie, agreed to submit the question to arbitration, under a clause of the treaty of 1928, but Italy refused to allow this. Abyssinia then appealed to the League of Nations, which persuaded Italy to withdraw its objections to arbitration, whilst Britain made a gesture of peace unparalleled in history. If Italy would agree to leave Abyssinia independent, Britain not only guaranteed to secure her a favourable adjustment of frontier in the disputed region, but offered to give Italy a portion of British Somaliland. This offer, however, was flatly rejected by Mussolini. Meanwhile the arbitrators had decided that Wal-wal had been an unfortunate incident in which neither side was to blame, and that therefore Italy had no claim to compensation. Whilst the arbitration was proceeding, other "incidents" took place in the same region. By the end of the summer of 1935, the League had drawn up a plan by which Abyssinia was to become a League protectorate, whilst the frontier was to be adjusted to satisfy both the Italian claims to the Ogaden area and the Ethiopian demand for a seaport. Since the proposed seaport and its connecting "corridor" would mean taking land from Italy, this alone secured its rejection by Mussolini, though Haile Selassie expressed approval of the scheme. The Italians were now demanding that Abyssinia should be expelled from the League of Nations as a savage nation that openly flouted League principles by tolerating slavery. Further argument was interrupted by the invasion of Abyssinia by an Italian army on 3 October 1935.

For the next six months Abyssinia dominated European political discussions. The local problem was of minor importance; the main interest lay in the fact that here was a war undertaken by a member of the League of Nations in violation of the Covenant. The affair could not be explained away by legal technicalities like the affairs of Vilna and Corfu. It was not even a case of a punitive expedition; a war of conquest had begun. The League showed no hesitation in declaring Italy to have broken the Covenant; over the question of applying coercion to the aggressor there was much less unanimity. The Covenant had envisaged a complete economic blockade for a case of this kind; a blockade was decided on, but not a complete one. Whilst sanctioning the supply of arms to Abyssinia, the League imposed an embargo on the export of

arms and certain "key-imports" to Italy, but though this covered articles that were specifically munitions of war, some articles, such as petrol, were not included. At the same time a boycott of imports from Italy was declared, and all loans and credit facilities to the Italian Government were prohibited. These "sanctions" came into force on 18 November.

Italy withdrew its representatives from the League of Nations but did not resign its membership; formal resignation could not take effect except after two years' notice, and it was decided to simply ignore the League. Italy accepted the challenge of sanctions, and declared a ban on trade of any description with any nation that acted on the League order for sanctions. Austria and Hungary were ready to relax sanctions in favour of their recent ally, and Bulgaria took much the same attitude. Meanwhile the hostility of the League stimulated Italy to a more warlike mood. Vast meetings in support of the war and in protest against the League were called all over the country. Military training was intensified, and the State was given a monopoly of all transactions respecting coal, copper, tin and nickel. As a patriotic gesture, many thousands of Italian women gave their gold wedding-rings as a contribution to the expenses of the campaign in Ethiopia. The entry of the Italian army into Adowa—which was felt to be a wiping out of the disgrace of 1896—was greeted with tumultuous enthusiasm all over Italy.

This defiance of the League was well-grounded, for Italy felt sure that sanctions would not be carried to an extreme. It was not so much the friendly attitude of little states like Austria and Hungary that counted; there was obvious reluctance on the part of France to take part in strong measures of coercion against the country with which she had so recently come to an agreement. France was now more than ever nervous about German aggression, and it was as well to do nothing to alienate Italy and throw her into the arms of Hitler. The conduct of the League as a whole, therefore, though striking, was weakened by lack of thoroughness and unanimity. This weakness was particularly notable in regard to oil sanctions. To cut off supplies of petrol would paralyse most of the modern nations, not only as regards warfare but in economic organisation generally. Yet, while numerous less essential articles were subjected to embargo, petrol remained free. It was argued that whilst a great oil-exporting country like the United States

remained outside the League, an embargo on petrol would be useless, yet it would certainly have resulted in a restriction of supplies, and exactly the same argument applied to many other commodities that were included in the list of sanctions. The exclusion of petrol from the embargo exposed the League to a good deal of ridicule, and certainly tended to discredit its reputation.

Two months after the war started, the collective action of the League received another blow. The French Government of Pierre Laval persuaded the British Government to approve a scheme for offering Italy a large slice of Abyssinia in return for a cessation of hostilities. The terms were sent to the Italian and Abyssinian Governments, whilst the British and French ambassadors at Addis Ababa received instructions to bring pressure to bear on Haile Selassie to accept them. This "going behind the backs of the League" provoked a storm of protest from the supporters of collective security all over the world, and the British public revolted at the idea of rewarding the aggressor by a present of a large part of the victim's territory. The Baldwin Government hurriedly repudiated its actions and made the Foreign Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, scapegoat. Hoare resigned office, and the concession scheme was dropped. The incident had still further encouraged Italy to ignore the protests of the League.

Meanwhile the war had been proceeding. The main Italian army—commanded at first by General de Bono and afterwards by Marshal Badoglio—moved southwards from Eritrea, occupying Adowa before the end of the year and defeating the Ethiopians at Enderta and Shire in the early weeks of 1936. A secondary force under General Graziani moved northwards from Somalia across the desert of Ogaden. Difficulties of transport on the poor tracks of Abyssinia proved too much for the large Italian forces, and the main army was held up for many weeks whilst new roads were engineered—roads that wore out with the heavy traffic almost as soon as they were completed. It was generally expected that the advent of the summer rains would hold up the Italian advance before it could cover half the distance to the capital at Addis Ababa. Use was made of both aerial bombing and poison-gas, but the Italians relied mainly on infantry and artillery. By the middle of March 1936, in spite of some victories and the desertion to the Italians of several Ethiopian tribes, it looked as though the advance had been definitely held up.

But instead of playing for time by a stonewalling defence in the mountainous regions, the Abyssinians decided to risk an offensive with their main fighting force. At the end of March the attack was launched, and was an utter failure. Following up their advantage, the Italians pursued the routed enemy towards their capital. In the first week of April Gondar was occupied; a month later Haile Selassie fled to Djibouti in French Somaliland and the capital surrendered to Marshal Badoglio. The rest of the campaign consisted of mere "round-ups" of fleeing detachments. Abyssinia was forthwith declared annexed to Italy, and King Victor Emmanuel was proclaimed Emperor of Ethiopia.

The League of Nations now indulged in long discussions as to whether it should admit complete failure and call off sanctions or maintain the embargoes as a measure of outlawry against a state that had violated the Covenant. Eventually, in July, sanctions were called off. The climax of humiliation came when the Italian delegates entered a protest against the continued appearance of representatives from Abyssinia at the League meetings. After much discussion, the delegates from the conquered country were allowed to remain "for the coming session", and the Italian representatives left Geneva. Haile Selassie, after a journey to England *via* Palestine, appeared to make his final pathetic appeal to the League on whose support he had relied to save his country from conquest by a foreign Power.

The successful completion of the Abyssinian campaign in the teeth of the opposition of the League was an even greater triumph for Mussolini than the tearing up of the Treaty of Versailles was for Hitler. Germany had at least kept her activities within her own borders. Within six months of the fall of Addis Ababa Italy was to have a further opportunity of asserting her power in foreign parts. The Spanish civil war began, and a Fascist Government was established at Burgos. Numerous Italians landed in Spain to assist the Fascist party there, whilst munitions and aircraft were sent by the Italian Government. In November Italy formally recognised the Burgos Government as the true Government of Spain. The same attitude was taken by the German Nazis, and within a few months Germany and Italy were vying with one another to prove that their long arms extended into the Spanish Sierras and that the Nationalist advance was due to their own particular efforts. It was rumoured that the Spanish Fascists had

promised the Balearic Islands to Italy in return for her help; also that the Canary Islands had been similarly promised to Germany. The whole of Europe was in a ferment over the business. France suggested a general pact of non-intervention, and a conference was held in London to arrange for the "keeping of the ring" whilst the two Spanish parties fought out their own quarrel. Both Italy and Germany eventually agreed to the establishment of a joint-blockade of the Powers to ensure the neutrality of outside states, but the work of the Non-intervention Committee was hampered by frequent charges of evasion of the regulations and by unfortunate incidents in which foreign ships became exposed to attack by aircraft and submarines. As a result of one of these attacks on a German warship in the early summer of 1937, Germany withdrew from the blockade-cordon, and Italy followed suit.

The external aggressions of Italy—at Corfu, in Abyssinia, and in Spain—created a fear among the democratic countries that Mussolini was intent upon wholesale national expansion under the guise of a Fascist crusade, in which possibly German Nazism would take part. As early as 1930 Mussolini had declared that Fascism was not for Italy alone; it was "of universal application, its ideas, doctrine and realisation". He hinted that Fascism would be prepared to lend its aid in a crusade against Bolshevism. Fascist parties, copying the Italian movement closely both in their political ideas and in their external trappings, appeared in almost every country of Europe. In 1934 there was held an international Fascist Congress at Montreux, where representatives from Great Britain, France, Poland and Switzerland appeared. Yet two factors tended to discount the significance of these developments. In the first place the Fascist groups in most countries were extremely small; nowhere except in Spain did the movement make real headway either among the masses or among the capitalist classes. In the second place Fascism by its very nature precluded the domination of one Fascist nation over another; patriotism and national self-assertion were the central points of the system. A Fascist Italy, growing ever more powerful and imposing its dominance on less happy lands, was an idea consistent with Mussolini's teachings; a world of Fascist states, all bent on self-assertion, and yet all subservient to Italy, was a contradiction in terms. The little Fascist parties in other countries

were naturally enthusiastic for their "big brother" in Italy as long as they were weak and out of office; that they would retain their adoration for Mussolini after gaining power was contrary to the whole experience of history. Russia once shed her blood freely to establish a "big Bulgaria" in the Balkans, for the Czar was the big white god of the victims of the Turkish atrocities. Disraeli wielded the whole might of the British Empire to reduce this Russophil Bulgaria within narrow limits; yet within a few years Russia was refusing help to her friends further west for the reason that "she did not want to create another Bulgaria in Montenegro".

A less calculable problem lies in the future of Italy when Mussolini no longer holds the reins. The prospect of any internal revolt sufficiently strong to overthrow the Fascist regime seems remote, but many observers believe that the personality of the dictator is so overwhelming that his demise would plunge Italy into the same kind of confusion that followed the death of Oliver Cromwell in England. There is certainly no outstanding personality that suggests itself as the natural successor to the present dictator. Yet this may be due merely to the fact that Mussolini towers so high, both on account of his own qualities and through the artifices of propaganda. A range of mountains may all be lofty, but one mighty peak may cause the others to look small. Few could have foreseen the effective dictatorship of Stalin in Russia after the domination of the very different personality of Lenin. Mussolini is not yet an old man: he has escaped three separate attempts upon his life, but assassination is not the only peril to life in this age of "moving accidents". Nobody can very accurately forecast what the "second generation" of Fascism will be like.

SPAIN

Spain had taken no part in the Great War. Although a large country, about twice the size of Great Britain, Spain was of little importance in international politics, in spite of her glorious past. Of her twenty million population, nearly half were illiterate, and the masses were generally sunk in poverty, dirt and ignorance. In the agricultural regions, where huge estates were the rule, the absentee landlords drew their rents from a peasantry that in

many districts were cultivating the soil by mediaeval methods, little irrigation—very badly needed in many provinces—having been effected since Moorish times. Communications were generally bad; there were few railways for so extensive a country and fewer good roads. The provinces, often isolated from one another by high mountain ranges, lived their separate lives. Such industries as existed—and they had been artificially stimulated by the war conditions in the rest of Europe—were concentrated in a few towns and suffered a slump when exposed to the normal peace-time competition of the great industrial nations.

Spanish politics had been stormy for more than a century. A democratic movement had arisen during the struggle against Joseph Bonaparte, and had continued through days of persecution and triumph under the restored Bourbon dynasty. The democratic “Liberals” were always a small minority of the people, almost entirely confined to urban areas, and out of sympathy with the rural interests of the bulk of the population. The Church, one of the greatest landowners in the country, threw its weight on the “Conservative” side, which was naturally headed by the wealthy landowning aristocracy. The traditions of Spanish political technique were violent, periods of coercive despotism alternating with periods of unstable, quarrelsome democracy. During part of the nineteenth century the situation was complicated by the appearance of a new “Spanish succession” question, in which the “Carlists”—the supporters of the Salic Law who fought for Prince Carlos—showed a more intransigent Conservatism than the upholders of the family of Queen Isabella. For six years after 1868 Spain was a welter of anarchy and political confusion, experiencing in turn a constitutional king brought over from Italy, a republic, and a restored monarchy under Alfonso XII. The posthumous son of Alfonso XII was accepted as king from the day of his birth in 1885, and during his minority the Liberals succeeded in establishing universal male suffrage, a Parliament of two Houses, and Cabinet Government.

With no money to conduct a spirited foreign policy, the Spanish monarchy counted for little or nothing in the councils of Europe. The bulk of its great colonial empire revolted in the early part of the nineteenth century, and was never reconquered. The last colonies of any serious value—Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines—were conquered by the United States in 1898, and

Spain was left with a few barren strips of territory on the African coast. Political activities in Spain were thus thrown back entirely into domestic channels; when Alfonso XIII tried to initiate a forward policy in Morocco, it was soon evident that even this little adventure was beyond the resources of so ramshackle a state as poverty-stricken Spain.

During the period of the Great War, and for a few years after, parliamentary politics were a matter of group-combinations, there being, however, two broad federations of groups that were known as Liberals and Conservatives. General elections were characterised by wholesale coercion, corruption and fraud, and the average parliamentary politician was good for little more than fine speech-making, accompanied by a genius for intrigue and a capacity for profitable jobbery. In the ever-shifting kaleidoscope of Spanish politics no less than twelve Cabinets held office during the period 1918 to 1923. Outside Parliament there was a strong Communist movement, as well as a more moderate Labour movement organised with patient thoroughness for forty years by Paul Iglesias, who died in 1925. Spain, too, was remarkable for the fact that it was the only country in which Anarchism made headway among the masses. Anarchists—who held that all political Governments were wrong in principle and that the people should be left to organise their spontaneous plans for social adjustment without specific law or Constitution—existed in all European countries, but outside Spain they were but a handful of “cranks”: the Anarchist organisations of Catalonia numbered tens of thousands of supporters, who regarded Socialists and Communists as even worse enemies than the older political groups, since they wished to subordinate the people to the all-embracing control of the State. The most active centre of agitation was Barcelona, where the left-wing tendencies of a poorly paid crowd of factory-workers were reinforced by the old Home Rule tendencies of the Catalans. There had been a terrible civil war here in 1909, both Government and rebels showing equal ferocity. The Basque provinces of the north coast, with the miners and iron-workers of the Bilbao region, were another centre of disorder, and here too a provincial separatist spirit prevailed.

The general conditions of Spanish political life witnessed nothing new until the year 1923, when—following on Mussolini’s establishment of Fascist rule in Italy—Spain was placed under a

dictatorship. In that year, Michael Primo de Rivera, Marquis of Estella, headed a military revolt at Barcelona, marched on Madrid, and persuaded King Alfonso XIII to entrust the government of Spain to his hands. For the next seven years the country was under a dictatorship.

Primo de Rivera—usually known in Spain as the Marquis of Estella—proved a statesman of conspicuous energy. He dispensed with Parliament altogether, and governed by royal decree. Military rulers were established in all the provinces; all town councils were dissolved—to be replaced by military administrators; martial law was enforced for a considerable period, terminating only in 1925. There was a continual and severe censorship of the Press. But de Rivera was not content with merely negative measures. A great campaign of public works was instituted; new railways and roads were constructed, a huge scheme of hydro-electric power was set in motion, hundreds of new schools were opened. The telephone service, from being one of the most inefficient in Europe, became one of the most efficient. A limited Government control over industry was established in 1926, no new enterprise being allowed to start without Government sanction. For the first time for many years the national finances were conducted with efficiency and economy, and in 1928 Spain witnessed the unusual phenomenon of a budget surplus. There is no doubt whatever that the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera effected great reforms and more genuine material progress than any previous Government in modern Spain.

From a political point of view the great weakness of the Rivera dictatorship was that it made little attempt to appeal to the emotions of the masses. Mussolini electrified the nation by his universal campaign of popular demonstrations, badges, salutes, and uniforms; the people were made to feel that they were partners in a great scheme of national regeneration. The Marquis of Estella's party—the "Patriotic Union"—made little attempt to bring the masses into active co-operation with the Government, and even the change of name to "Sacred Union" in 1928 was a symptom of weakness. Far more popular enthusiasm was roused by the efforts of the dictator's enemies; for Communists, Socialists and Anarchists were reinforced by the discarded politicians of the old parliamentary groups in a common hatred of the dictator.

which foreshadowed the later "Popular Front". The popular novelist Ibañez, an exile in Paris, carried on a furious campaign against de Rivera; Anarchists bombed King Alfonso's train in 1925; malcontent elements in the army raised a revolt at Valladolid, Pamplona and Segovia in 1926. The jails were packed with political prisoners, but there was no enlistment of coloured shirts to counterbalance the spread of Opposition movements.

De Rivera inherited the thorny Moroccan problem. In 1921 King Alfonso had personally organised a forward movement in the Spanish Protectorate in that country, and the venture had proved unlucky. A Spanish army had been cut off and captured at Anual, and the European regiments had been penned in along the Mediterranean coast. General Berenguer, who was held responsible for the Anual disaster, was put on trial in 1924 and dismissed from the army, but the effect of this undoubtedly popular action was nullified by his restoration to military command in a few weeks' time by special order of the King. It was fortunate for the dictator that the Riffs provoked a war with the French authorities in the other part of Morocco, for the joint campaign which followed resulted in the defeat and capture of the redoubtable Abd el Krim and the submission of the Spanish Zone in 1927. De Rivera also tried to increase Spanish prestige in Europe by demanding for his country a permanent seat on the Council of the League of Nations at the time when Germany was admitted as a member in 1926. Here he suffered a complete rebuff, and it was little consolation that Spain withdrew her membership of the League for two years.

De Rivera intended to introduce a modified form of parliamentary Constitution. In 1925 he reconstructed his Cabinet to strengthen the civilian as against the military elements, and in 1926 he held a plebiscite to confirm his position as ruler. In the plebiscite, however, he announced that no provision would be made for recording the votes of opponents, and the securing of six million votes for the dictatorship made little impression on public opinion. In 1927 he nominated a "National Assembly" to assist in drawing up a Constitution, but those members who had formerly been active members of the Liberal or Conservative parties refused to attend, and those who met proceeded to oppose the whole idea of the existing form of rule. This Assembly was summoned to meet from time to time, but no progress was made

with the new constitution. In 1929 it was strengthened by the addition of representatives of professional and Labour organisations and by renewed invitations to the old political leaders. The Labour associations and the politicians refused to respond, whilst the lawyers showed their hostility to de Rivera by choosing as their leading representative Sanchez Guerra—a Conservative leader and ex-premier—who was at the time in prison. By the end of the year 1929 the idea of a new Constitution had been completely dropped.

By this time Primo de Rivera's position had become critical. No popular movement supported him, whilst his former friends in the army had become jealous of him. His unpopularity was increased, except in Church circles, by his recognition of a second-rate college run by Jesuits as qualified to grant university degrees, and as a result of violent riots Madrid University was closed down for two months in 1929. A court-martial on Sanchez Guerra acquitted the prisoner, though the judges were all military officers. It was this acquittal that convinced the dictator that his power was tottering, and he told the King that he could not continue to accept the responsibilities of government without a direct vote of confidence from the army, without whose support he knew that he could not survive. As the officers of regiment after regiment refused to endorse the proposed vote of confidence de Rivera abandoned his last hopes of continuing his work, and in 1930 he handed in his resignation and retired to Paris, where he died a few months later.

The departure of the dictator let loose the whole of the pent-up opposition on the King. General Berenguer was made Prime Minister, as a trusty supporter of Alfonso, but he had no authority outside the palace. A republican revolution was openly preached in the great cities and even from the chairs of the university professors. Strikes and riots broke out all over the country, and Berenguer made no attempt to punish their leaders. The outbreak of a petty rising among the junior army officers at Jaca near Huesca and at the Madrid aerodrome provoked a belated and rather weak display of vigour on the part of the Government. The risings were suppressed, and the Liberal leader Alcalá-Zamora, who had just declared for republicanism, was arrested. A few rebels and agitators were put on trial, but the Government made no serious effort to secure convictions and all were acquitted.

A general election was ordered for 1931, and the old municipal and county councils were restored. The municipal elections of 1931 showed big republican majorities in the large towns, and it was evident that the parliamentary election would be likely to return a House which would possess a strongly republican feeling. The only hope for the monarchists, in fact, was in the rural constituencies, where landlord and Church influence might still prove effective. Before the elections could be held, however, a revolution broke out. On 14 April 1931 Barcelona rose for the "Catalan Republic"; a few hours later Madrid rose for the "Spanish Republic". Berenguer had given place to Admiral Aznar as Premier a few weeks before, and the Admiral made no attempt to resist the rebels. King Alfonso fled from Spain, and the Madrid rebels acclaimed Alcalá-Zamora as head of a provisional government. Amidst an orgy of rioting and excesses—during which more than a hundred churches and convents were burnt—the elections were held; 291 republicans were returned as against 136 moderates and 42 conservatives, and when Parliament met the Spanish Republic was proclaimed.

The Constitution of 1931 established a parliamentary democracy, with votes for both sexes and a single-chamber parliament. The religious orders were placed under strict State control, and—contrary to the Catholic principle—divorce was to be recognised in Spain. The clauses dealing with the Church were not passed until after long discussion, forty-three supporters of the Government going into Opposition on the subject. Alcalá-Zamora himself resigned on the question of the religious orders, but he agreed to return as President, whilst Manuel Azaña became Prime Minister. General Berenguer was again put on trial, and was committed to prison for twenty years.

Previous Spanish democratic revolutions had usually been followed by periods of anarchy, in which everyone behaved as if the new-found liberty conferred the right to take any and every violent step that suggested itself. These periods of anarchy had then been followed by a reaction in favour of law and order which brought the conservative forces back into control. The revolution of 1931 was followed by just such another wave of disorder. There were riots, strikes and murders all over Spain. Peasants, who had been promised small holdings by the new Government, proceeded to seize estates offhand. Factory-workers

demanded immediate increases of pay irrespective of legislation or the condition of the businesses—this was the period of the great economic crisis. The police everywhere met with violent resistance, many being murdered. The Anarchists of Llobregat in Aragon raised an insurrection, which was put down by troops, a hundred of the rebels being deported to the sandy wastes of Rio del Oro. Conservative army officers, led by General Sanjurjo, rose in Seville, and were also suppressed, the General being condemned to death but sent to prison instead. Before the end of the year 1932 the jails were as full as under de Rivera's dictatorship, whilst a hundred newspapers had been suppressed. During 1933 Socialist and Communist disturbances were frequent, particularly in Catalonia. Outrages were committed by both rebels and Government forces.

The Azaña Government meanwhile proceeded to pass an agrarian law providing for partial expropriation of the big landlords in favour of the peasantry. A "Catalan Statute" was also carried, granting a subordinate parliament to that independent-spirited province. In 1933 a Religious Orders Act prohibited members of these organisations from teaching in schools. The spread of disorder in the country and internal dissensions among the republican groups led to a series of political crises during 1933; Azaña gave place to Lerroux, and he to Barrios. The Cabinet had at first included members that would be described as Liberal, Radical and Socialist, but the Socialist elements were eventually excluded from office, and in 1933 Barrios secured a dissolution of Parliament in order to appeal to the electorate against the extremists. The result was a Socialist rout, that party being reduced from 117 seats to 58. It was reckoned that the Right, or Conservative parties, totalled 207 seats all told, whilst the Left groups held only a hundred seats, with a "Centre" of 167 seats held by moderates. Lerroux, a member of the Radical party, returned to the premiership, and a policy of moderate reform, with law and order as its first essential, was announced.

There ensued a conflict between the moderate Republican Government and the left-wing extremists as fierce as any that had been waged between monarchists and republicans. Late in 1934 the Basques demanded Home Rule and proceeded to hold entirely illegal elections to a local parliament. Fighting broke out round Bilbao and general anarchy supervened in the district.

A Socialist rising in Madrid and in Catalonia was suppressed by troops. The most serious rising, however, was that of the Asturian miners, who were put down only after a fierce and bloodthirsty civil war, in which both sides committed appalling atrocities, and in which the city of Oviedo was captured by Government troops after a severe bombardment. By the end of the year, nearly all the Socialist leaders, including the members of Parliament, were either in prison or in exile. Fifty Trade Unions had been dissolved, and the Statute of Catalonia had been repealed. The number of political prisoners was estimated at 35,000.

The year 1935 saw the climax of the reaction against the enthusiasm of the republican victory of 1931. Parliament had become a welter of intrigue. The Liberal Government was execrated by the left-wing supporters in as violent terms as had been used against Primo de Rivera. Riots and murders were of weekly occurrence in nearly all the provinces. The President, Alcalá-Zamora, was at loggerheads with the Cabinet, pardoning rebels who had been sentenced at the instance of the Government. There was also corruption of the old type; the Nombela affair, in which it was shown that a Colonial Office official had received bribes for the allotment of lands in Morocco, caused a great outcry, whilst in the Strauss affair it appeared that bribes had been asked from an applicant for a licence to open a casino. The reform programme had been carried little further than the statute-book. Some big estates had been broken up for the benefit of the peasantry, the owners being compensated by the grant to them of bonds bearing interest at 4 per cent. The clergy had been formally forbidden to teach in schools, but in many provinces the old Church schools were still flourishing. The Socialist clubs, which had all been closed during the rebellions of 1934, were allowed to open again in May 1935, but the general impression was that at the next election there would be a further swing towards conservatism.

Under these circumstances the parties of the left organised a great campaign for united action. Their propaganda emphasised the fact that the removal of the King had left the country under the control of the same essentially conservative interests as before and called for a second revolution to make the reforms of the first revolution effective. The "Popular Front" formed at the beginning of 1936 included representatives of Socialists, Com-

munists, Anarchists and advanced Liberals. This was the first time that the Anarchists consented to take part in ordinary political campaigning, though they still refused to put up candidates for the elections. In the negotiations for drawing up the lists of "Popular Front" candidates the Liberals—the most moderate section of the alliance—succeeded in getting a very favourable percentage in the final selection. In February 1936 the general election was held. The "Popular Front" obtained just over half the number of votes cast, but secured 270 seats out of 470. The Conservative groups of the Right secured 135 seats and the moderate Centre parties 65 seats. There were charges of tampering with ballot-boxes and other irregular election practices, and some constituencies had to hold the election over again. Of the "Popular Front" members 162 were Liberals, 94 Socialists and 16 Communists. During the last year of the old Parliament there had been frequent Cabinet changes, Lerroux, Chapaprieto, and Portela-Valladares succeeding each other as Premier. Azaña now took over the premiership, and the first act of the new Parliament was to vote President Alcalá-Zamora out of office and replace him by Azaña, who resigned the premiership to Casares Quiroga. In July he gave place in his turn to Giral, who reconstructed his Cabinet to exclude the Socialists and Communists, the latter seceding from Parliament.

The next acts of the new Parliament were to grant an amnesty to the 30,000 political prisoners then in jail and to pass a Home Rule resolution in favour of Catalonia, whilst Home Rule was also promised for Biscaya. Meanwhile the supporters of the extremist parties did not wait for parliamentary action to bring about the revolution they desired. All over Spain the peasants were seizing land, and the factory-workers struck for higher wages. In four months there were 350 strikes, 250 murders and 250 cases of setting fire to churches. On their side the Conservative extremists took up arms against their opponents, and there was a replica of the state of Italy in the last months before the march on Rome, the firebrands of both wings committing outrages on a large scale. There was, however, no spread of Fascism, though José Primo de Rivera, son of the dictator, organised a Fascist society called the Phalanx. Several leading army officers, including Generals Franco and Goded, were arrested and transported to the Canary Islands and the Balearics.

As had been so often the case in Spain, it was among the army officers that the counter-revolution was organised, the leading spirit being now General Sanjurjo, who went to Germany to study Nazi methods and returned to organise the forces of reaction on similar lines. The murder of Calvo Sotelo, the leading Conservative member of Parliament, on 13 July, precipitated the movement, and on 17 July there were military risings in all the garrison towns. In the south and west these risings were successful; Seville, Cadiz, Toledo, Cordoba, Badajoz, Burgos, Valladolid and Oviedo all fell into the hands of the rebels. In the east, while successful in Saragossa, Pamplona and Huesca, they were over-powered in Barcelona after a few hours' fighting. In the capital the rebels were driven back into a barracks, where they were shelled into surrender. The Morocco garrisons all went over to the insurgents. General Sanjurjo was killed in an aeroplane smash at the outset of the rising, and General Franco, who returned by air to take command of the rebels in Morocco, assumed supreme direction of the movement. It was estimated that three-quarters of the troops, half the regular police and three-quarters of the recently formed Shock Police were on the Conservative side.

Desperate fighting now began all over Spain. At first the main efforts were concentrated on the seizure of the capital. Franco, with an army composed largely of Moors, and including the famous Foreign Legion, after securing the reduction of Badajoz in August, advanced up the Tagus through Talavera and Toledo to Madrid, there being heavy fighting at Toledo, where the city changed hands more than once. In November the main armies were facing one another in the southern and western suburbs of Madrid, and—though the Government was removed to Valencia—the rebel advance was definitely checked at this point. The armies, after severe fighting, settled down to fortified lines within the outer ring of suburbs. Meanwhile local campaigns were proceeding in the north and east. Whilst the Government forces were successful in Aragon, besieging the rebels in Huesca, the fortunes of war varied in the north; Irun and San Sebastian were stormed by rebels, whilst at Oviedo the Government troops drove back the rebels and besieged them in the city.

At the end of the year 1936 it was obvious that the war would last for some considerable time longer. Each side controlled about half the country, though the area under rebel control was

rather more fertile and productive of supplies than that dominated by the Government. The line between the two parties extended for about a thousand miles from the middle of the Pyrenees, through Huesca and Saragossa to Madrid, and then by a wide sweep through Toledo and Merida back to Cordoba, and thence south-eastwards to Granada and the Mediterranean; there was a second fighting-front along the north coast, from Oviedo to Bilbao. The extremely mountainous nature of the bulk of the country and the absence of good roads confined military activity to a few clearly marked lines of movement, and the situation somewhat resembled that during the English civil war of Cromwell's time, numerous small local armies contesting the mastery in different provinces. Both sides organised their government on a war basis. In September 1936 Giral had resigned the premiership to the Socialist leader Largo Caballero, who removed the seat of Government to Valencia in November. He had great trouble with the independent spirit of the Home Rule areas, especially in Catalonia, which insisted on retaining the bulk of its troops in the neighbourhood of Barcelona, and also with the Anarchist elements, who actually started a small but unsuccessful rebellion of their own in Barcelona early in 1937. The Communists rallied round the Government from the first days of the rebellion, and in 1937 a definite pact was signed between the leaders of the Socialist and Communist parties. There were also internal dissensions among the members of the Cabinet, Caballero resigning the premiership in 1937 in favour of Negrín. On the rebel side, General Franco took the title of "Chief of State" in October 1936, and the rebels adopted the name of "Nationalists".

For the greater part of 1937 the civil war continued without decisive victories on either side. What progress was made was on the Nationalist side, which, after very severe fighting, reduced the Government enclave in the north by the successive capture of Bilbao and Santander; the fortress of Gijon held out until October. The Government armies failed to reduce Huesca, or even the isolated outpost held by the Nationalists at Teruel. At Madrid there was an outburst of furious fighting in the late summer of 1937, the Government forces making a slight advance. All things considered, it seemed as though the weight of the balance was slowly moving in favour of the Nationalists.

The prolonged civil war in Spain excited the attention of the

world, for it was regarded abroad as essentially a struggle between those forces of democracy and dictatorship which seemed to be disputing the control of all nations. Statesmen and writers were already talking of a "Fascist bloc" and a "Democratic bloc", as though international politics were dividing, not according to national aspirations, but on rival systems of domestic government. There was so much in General Franco's organisation that suggested Fascism that the Nationalist party appealed strongly to Italy; Sanjurjo had obtained some of his ideas from the Nazis, and Germany sympathised with the insurgent cause in Spain. The inclusion of the Communists in the Government ranks evoked the sympathy of Russia, whilst the democratic states generally supported the "Popular Front" and the parliamentary majority in Spain. Thousands of volunteers went out to help their political friends; Italians and Germans figured conspicuously on the Nationalist side, along with some Irish Catholics, whilst Russians, Italian opponents of Fascism, and some British and French subjects helped the Valencia Government. In November 1936, when it seemed likely that Franco would force his way into Madrid, both Germany and Italy formally recognised the Nationalist Government—which had its headquarters at Burgos—as the real Government of Spain, and throughout the struggle military and air units from Italy, Germany and Russia took active part in the fighting.

France too had now a "Popular Front" Government, but had no wish to become embroiled in a Spanish war, and in August 1936 France took the lead in proposals for a general non-intervention agreement. Keenly supported by Great Britain, France obtained the summoning of an international congress in London, at which a satisfactory measure of agreement was attained. Only Portugal, which sympathised with the Spanish Nationalists, showed any great reluctance to suspend active assistance, but in a few weeks a pact of non-intervention was accepted by all the European countries. A blockade to intercept war material was established by land and sea, the British, French, Germans, Italians and Portuguese each taking a sector. There were frequent charges on either side of "cheating", the patrols allowing arms to pass through to their own friends whilst denying facilities to their opponents. Then units of the Spanish navy, which was about equally divided between the two sides, began to fire at blockade

vessels, and several war vessels and merchant-ships of the blockading Powers were hit by torpedoes. An attack on a German warship, presumably by Spanish Government craft, led to a German bombardment of Almeria and to both Germany and Italy withdrawing from the blockade and denouncing the non-intervention pact in 1937, and a further conference was called at the instance of France and Britain at Nyon, near Geneva. Italy and Germany refused to attend this conference, on the ground that they would not negotiate with Russia, whom they accused of flagrantly violating the first pact, but both expressed themselves as sympathetic to the idea of a more effective blockade. The whole business was provocative of strong feeling and led to the devotion of a vast amount of time by the statesmen of Europe, but the general impression was left that no country was really keen on staking very much on their friends in Spain.

Though a deadlock seems to have been reached on the main fronts, the gradual conquest of the northern enclave by the Nationalists has released forces which may prove decisive in the main field of action. The Valencia Government has meanwhile appealed for support from less revolutionary circles than in the early stages; the Catholic mass, which had for long been prohibited in Madrid, was again tolerated in August 1937, whilst in the following month the decree of exile against the ex-premiers Portela-Valladares and Maura—the latter a Conservative—was revoked. Foreign intervention on a larger scale than hitherto seems improbable—though not impossible. The eventual triumph of the Valencia Government would almost certainly be followed by a split between at least two of its sections, for the Anarchists are by no means reconciled to parliamentary government, still less to Communism or Socialism. The triumph of the Nationalist party might be followed by schism in the ranks, though that party is somewhat more closely-knit than the "Popular Front". In any case, civil war for more than a twelvemonth cannot but leave Spain severely distressed and economically handicapped. Previous happenings in Spain suggest that whichever side wins there will be a period of violent proscription of the losers, followed by a counter-revolution at no very distant date.

PORTUGAL

In the year 1910 the ancient monarchy of Portugal was overthrown. Two years before, King Carlos and his eldest son had been murdered in the streets of Lisbon, and after a brief reign his second son Manuel was expelled from the country. The Republic established in 1910 did not bring about the golden age in Portugal. The mass of the people soon lost interest in their parliamentary government, and politics rapidly degenerated into a series of bitter faction-fights, whilst the politicians showed themselves egregiously corrupt. Under these circumstances the friends of the ex-king Manuel had little difficulty in rallying a strong royalist party, and for some years a restoration was by no means an unlikely event. Portugal associated herself with the Allied Powers in the Great War, and sent a small detachment to Flanders, but she got no territorial gains in the peace settlement, even in Africa, where this little European state of some six million people ruled a colonial empire of large extent but comparatively thinly populated. The population of the African colonies was little more than eight millions, whilst there were another million subjects in the Indian settlements, Macao and Timor.

Portugal had become a country of constant revolts and revolutions. At the end of 1918 President Sidonio Paes, who had established himself in power after a revolution in the previous year, was murdered. In 1919 a royalist rebellion at Oporto was defeated after a campaign between that city and Lisbon. The year 1920 saw no armed rebellions, but parliamentary politics were stormy, and within a twelvemonth there were no less than ten different Cabinets. In the following year the party that had got the worst of the 1917 revolution obtained a majority in Parliament, and promptly declared all the legislation passed since that revolution null and void. This provoked a rising of the Lisbon garrison, and another change of Cabinet followed. Within a few months there was another rising; the Prime Minister, an ex-minister, and Admiral Machado—the hero of the first republican revolution—were murdered, and the Government was again changed. There were risings in the capital in 1922, in 1923, in 1924, three in 1925—during one of which a warship fired shells into the city—and two in 1926. Political life had in fact degenerated

into a matter of personal feuds. The electors took little or no interest in public affairs, the municipalities were largely corrupt and very inefficient, attendance in Parliament was extremely slack and irregular, there being often no quorum for the transaction of business. Government finance was in a state of chaos, and floods of paper money had been issued. Cabinets followed one another in rapid succession, though one Premier, Silva, succeeded in retaining office for twenty-one months; this was the longest Ministry since the establishment of the Republic. Nor were conditions any more inspiring in the colonies, where misgovernment and corruption were rampant. The most notorious scandal of colonial administration during these years was in 1925, when it was discovered that the reserves of the Angola Bank consisted mainly of forged notes.

The second revolt of 1926 proved the first successful one since 1921, and Generals Da Costa and Carmona cleared the Houses of Parliament with their troops and established a Government under the lead of Da Costa. Within a few weeks the two generals quarrelled, and Carmona arrested Da Costa, establishing himself as dictator. Every political rebel in Portugal professed a programme of idealist reforms, but Carmona showed a determination to improve his country's condition unusual in these faction-leaders. He began his rule by the suppression of all the municipal councils in Portugal, as corrupt and inefficient, substituting Commissioners sent down from the central Government. A counter-revolution broke out at Oporto in 1927 and spread to Lisbon. After three days' fierce street-fighting in the capital General Carmona was victorious. The Government was threatened with disaster a few weeks after when an army officer entered the room where the Cabinet was in session and fired five shots from a revolver at the Ministers; by a miracle nobody was hurt, and after this incident the dictatorship of Carmona was established without further disturbances beyond a petty rising in Lisbon towards the end of the year.

In 1928 Carmona had himself elected as President, and appointed Dr Salazar as Prime Minister. The dictator's first task was now to reform the finances, which he proposed to do by the aid of a loan from the League of Nations. When the League coupled with its offer of a loan the condition that Portugal should accept League control of her finances, Carmona decided to make

the effort at reform without outside help. In this task he and Dr Salazar were remarkably successful; the budgets were now balanced, the amount of paper money was restricted, and sound financial methods became the rule at the Treasury. Even during the great economic crisis the Portuguese budgets were balanced. As time went on, Carmona studied Fascist methods, and formed a party called the "National Union" to support him. The electoral lists were revised so as to exclude all but those who joined this organisation from the right to vote. The new Constitution as finally drafted established a parliament elected indirectly by the heads of families, who elected parish councils; the parish councils then elected municipal councils and these elected county councils. All councillors, from parish to county, formed the electorate for parliament. The Constitution was accepted on a plebiscite in 1933. In 1932 Carmona had continued his term of office by decree for another three years. The parliament elected under the new Constitution in 1934 returned all the Government candidates in approved Fascist fashion. The electorate was estimated to number a tenth of the population; 80 per cent of the electorate voted for the Government list, the other 20 per cent abstained from voting. Next year the President was re-elected for a further term of office.

The form of government in Portugal was now following Fascist models, and Carmona talked of the "Corporative State". A strong patriotic movement was initiated. Portugal is the only country in the world to retain legislation of the type of the old English Navigation Acts, and in 1930 the port dues on Portuguese ships were reduced and preference was given to cargoes in Portuguese bottoms. In the same year a law was passed prohibiting the use of foreign words on advertisements and other public notices. Carmona raised the status of the overseas dominions by giving them the title of "Colonies" instead of their former designation of "Provinces". In this direction, however, his policy was not very successful, for revolts against the dictatorship took place in Madeira, the Cape Verde Islands, the Azores, Guinea, St Thomas and Prince's Islands, and Angola, all of which were put down by military force, Madeira being blockaded into surrender in 1931. At home there was the usual succession of plots, resulting in a petty military rising in 1928, a small revolt in Lisbon in 1931, a Communist riot in 1934, and a mutiny on two small

warships in the Tagus in 1936. In each case the dictator's troops proved easily victorious. There were also numerous arrests, including that of Preto, a Syndicalist, in 1934; he had organised a force of "Blue Shirts" to oppose the Government. There was also a strict censorship of the Press. The Prime Minister, Salazar, narrowly escaped assassination by a bomb in 1937.

The outbreak of the Spanish civil war in 1936 brought Portugal into the European limelight as a base from which arms were being supplied to the Spanish Fascists. The Socialist Government in Spain took it upon itself to search the mail-bags of the Portuguese embassy and to read the letters contained therein; this led to a breach of diplomatic relations. Portugal, however, entered the agreement for non-intervention, though frequent charges were subsequently made that Carmona and Salazar were conniving at serious breaches of this agreement and that arms were still reaching Franco's troops by way of the Portuguese frontier.

CHAPTER III

Eastern and Northern Europe

JUGOSLAVIA

Jugoslavia—the “land of the southern Slavs”—was not so much a new state as an enlargement of an old one. The various Slavonic tribes of the Balkan peninsula and the adjacent regions had all been conquered by the Turks in the great days of the Ottoman Empire, with the exception of a small group of mountaineers who in the fastnesses of the Black Mountains—“Montenegro”—extorted from the Turks a guarantee of independence. After the Ottoman Empire began to decay, these Slavonic districts were freed from Mohammedan rule, partly by foreign Christian armies and partly by purely local effort. In the time of Napoleon I, the Serbs of Belgrade successfully revolted against the Turks and established the independent State of Serbia, which was gradually extended southwards until hardly any Serbs remained under Ottoman rule. This national success turned the thoughts of the Serbs to an eventual absorption of the Slavonic districts that had been taken from the Turks in earlier times by the Habsburg armies, and which now formed part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

It was this national ambition of the Serbs that led to the famous murder of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand in 1914 and thus precipitated the Great War. The Serbs paid dearly for their hostility to the Dual Monarchy, for in 1915 their country was overrun by Austro-Hungarian and German troops, even the hitherto impregnable strongholds of Montenegro having to surrender to the heavy artillery of the invaders. With the collapse of the Central Powers fortune changed as if by magic. The Serbian Government, which had scarcely succeeded in clinging to a few acres of its own country, suddenly found itself in a position to control, not only its original territory, but all the coveted Slavonic lands that had formerly owned the Habsburgs as rulers.

The Versailles settlement enlarged the old Kingdom of Serbia into a “Serb, Croat and Slovene Kingdom”; its former population of some five millions was more than doubled. The legendary Scotsman whose son had been rescued from drowning lodged a

complaint that the lad's bonnet was missing; the Serbian Government in this hour of unexpected triumph and expansion worked itself into a fury because its gains were not still larger. The chief ground for dissatisfaction was the allotment of most of the Dalmatian coast to Italy, whilst the port of Fiume, the main natural outlet from Jugoslavia to the Adriatic, was to be an independent republic. Neither Italy nor Serbia was satisfied with this settlement. Italy for a time withdrew from the peace conference, though its delegates afterwards returned; Serbia flatly refused to sign such a treaty. Britain and France suggested compensating Jugoslavia by an extension into northern Albania, but President Wilson used all his influence against this, and the treaty confirmed the original proposals. Neither Italy nor Jugoslavia intended to observe these conditions, and the months following the treaty saw the extension of Italian control, under the direction of the fiery d'Annunzio, to Fiume. It was apparent that in any direct conflict Italy would be the stronger of the two disputants, and eventually, at the end of 1920, the Treaty of Rapallo between Italy and Jugoslavia gave the lion's share of the disputed territory to the former. Among the Jugoslavs generally, however, Italy remained the enemy, whose rapacious aggressions must sooner or later be avenged.

Compared with the Dalmatian question, other frontier problems were of minor importance. Montenegro was absorbed into the new state, after centuries of proud independence, the little national assembly accepting the amalgamation as inevitable. The plebiscite in Carinthia went in favour of Austria, and though the Serbian troops marched into the province to annul the result of the vote, the Allies threatened reprisals and the Jugoslavs withdrew. There were raids across the new Albanian frontier, but the League of Nations intervened in 1921 and restored peace. The definitive frontier with Rumania was settled by negotiation in 1923. The old Serbian Parliament, elected in 1912, remained until 1920, when a Constituent Assembly was elected for the new kingdom. A Constitution was drawn up, after much angry discussion, and came into force in 1921.

It was soon apparent that the new state was no resuscitation of a single nation. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had their own traditions and culture, whilst the Croats were separated from the Serbs by the gulf of religion, the former being Roman Catholics

and the latter Greek Church. The Slovenes, who numbered only about a million, were somewhat less hostile to a centralised Constitution, but the Croats, who represented about a quarter of the population of Jugoslavia, evinced a determination to enjoy local autonomy from the very first. When Dr Laginja was appointed Governor of Croatia in 1920, he refused to accept the office unless appointed by the whole Cabinet, since his original nomination by the Minister of the Interior seemed to derogate from the dignity of the Croat people. The new Constitution was opposed by the Croats as too strongly centralised, and when it became apparent that they would be outvoted the Croat members to the number of sixty-six absented themselves from the assembly. Though this assembly continued for nearly two years, only one Croat returned to take his seat. The proclamation of the Constitution was followed by riots in Zagreb, the Croat capital.

The first general election under the Constitution was held in 1923, and was fought mainly on racial lines. The Croats returned seventy members out of a total of 313, and refused to take their seats until the following year when, headed by Stephen Raditch, they began a violent agitation for home rule and also allied with the Republican party, whilst both Croats and Slovenes vigorously denounced the Government for truckling to Italy in the matter of the Adriatic ports. The Government retaliated by prohibiting mass-meetings of Croats, and in 1925, on the eve of a fresh general election, the Raditch party was declared illegal and numerous arrests were made. In spite of this Raditch and his followers secured sixty-seven seats; the Government, which obtained a majority of ten over all other parties, promptly cancelled the elections of Raditch and five of his chief supporters. The Croats were not prepared to carry their opposition as far as open rebellion, and Raditch showed himself willing to negotiate a compromise. Before the end of the year 1925 the Croat party had agreed to drop their republican attitude and the suspension of the leaders was cancelled.

For a couple of years there was an uneasy truce between the two racial elements. Then, in 1928, the feud blazed up again. The Government had just negotiated a loan from Italy, and in return gave Italy some commercial concessions; protests against this further example of "truckling to Italy" led to riots among Croats and Slovenes, and several deaths were caused. Parliamentary

debates became scenes of unrestrained passion, and on one occasion four Croat members were bodily flung out of the House. The newspapers were unblushingly calling for the blood of the leaders. The climax came when a Serb member named Ratchitch emptied a revolver into the front Croat bench, killing Stephen Raditch and his brother and wounding three other members. Destructive rioting at once broke out in Croatia; a Serb editor and a police official were murdered, and on the anniversary of the establishment of the Jugoslav state black flags were hung out in Zagreb. The Croat members seceded in a body from a Parliament where their lives had been shown to be in danger. Civil war seemed imminent.

The Croat disorders were not the only distressing feature of parliamentary life in Jugoslavia. All political parties tended to violence of both language and action. A strong Communist party, which returned sixty members to the Constituent Assembly, carried on an agitation which was marked by many outrages, including the murder of the ex-minister Drashkovitch in 1921, and the hurling of a bomb at the Prince Regent shortly before the death of old King Peter. Before the Constitution came into force the Communists had been expelled from Parliament and a Defence of the Realm Act was passed to strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with disorder. There was also much political intrigue among the numerous parties and a good deal of corruption. With parliamentary government toppling down in so many countries of Europe, it was natural that the idea of a dictatorship should suggest itself to those who were disgusted by the noisy violence and petty corruption of the existing Parliament. Of social and financial reform there was little, though an insurance scheme was launched for urban workmen in 1921. King Peter, who had risen to the throne after the revolution of 1903, when King Alexander Obrenovich and his wife Draga had been butchered, had been an invalid since a few weeks before the war, and his son Alexander Karageorgevitch acted as Regent until Peter's death in 1921. A number of coalition ministries representing groups which, though known by different party names—Radicals, Democrats, Peasants' party—were much alike in their aims, directed the government under a succession of not very distinguished premiers—Protitch, Davidovitch, Vesnitch, Pashitch, Uzonovitch.

Though parliamentary government in Jugoslavia was considerably discredited, and the murders in the House in 1928 brought the country to the verge of civil war, the reaction of 1929 came as a surprise to most observers. It was rather a royalist than a Fascist revolution, for there was no Fascist party of any significance in Jugoslavia, mainly because of the bitter hostility to everything Italian. When it was announced that King Alexander had appointed the commander of his bodyguard, General Zhivkovitch, as Prime Minister and had suspended the Constitution, it was at first believed that the interruption of democratic government was a temporary measure to enable a solution of the Croat question to be negotiated on the basis of a generous grant of home rule. For this reason the Croats welcomed the King's action. It was soon realised, however, that the King's aim was a unity and a centralisation even greater than had existed under the Constitution of 1921. The title of the state was changed from its triune form—*Kraljevina Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*—to Jugoslavija, and the realm was divided into nine new provinces, the boundaries of which cut drastically across the old provincial boundaries that had delimited Croatia and Slavonia. At the same time a new national law code was formulated, to replace the seven separate local law codes which had hitherto existed in the country. Local self-government was strangled by the suppression of all the municipal councils, which were replaced by bodies of Commissioners nominated by the Crown. To enforce submission to the new regime, a decree imposed the death penalty for plotting against the Government, and a strict censorship of the Press was instituted. Even the local "Sokols"—the physical culture societies—which had been characterised in Croatia and Slavonia by strong racialist feeling, were united by decree into a new Jugoslav Sokol, the officers of which were nominated by the Crown.

The disillusionment provoked a furious outburst of resentment in Croatia, which was not mollified by the sentence of twenty years' imprisonment imposed on the murderer of the Raditch brothers. Riots and outrages took place all over the west, and several assassinations occurred. The Government proceeded to arrest Dr Matchek, who had succeeded Stephen Raditch as leader of the Croat party, and in the following year, 1930, he was brought to trial with twenty-three other Croats. It was alleged that witnesses in this trial had been subjected to torture, but in the

event Matchek and eight others were acquitted, though the rest of the accused were found guilty and committed to prison. Though the administration of General Zhivkovitch was generally regarded as fairer to the Croats than previous Governments had been, there was much plotting and violence in Croatia. In 1931 there were serious riots at Zagreb University. In 1932 a Slovene plot was discovered which, though announced by the Government to be a Communist affair, was purely racial. Two executions followed, whilst the police in Croatian towns were in constant conflict with riotous mobs. In 1933 Dr Matchek was again arrested; this time he was sentenced to three years imprisonment. In 1934 twenty-six Croat agitators were sent to jail to serve sentences varying from five years to life. Assassinations, arrests, imprisonments and deportations continued throughout the five years from 1929 to 1934. The tale of tragedy reached a climax when a young Croat shot King Alexander dead while on a visit to France in October 1934.

Two years after the suppression of the old Parliament a new Constitution was issued by the King. Parliamentary government was restored, but with the safeguards of open voting instead of the ballot and a second chamber of which half the members were nominated by the Crown. At the same time all associations based on distinctions of race, religion or geographical areas were forbidden in the realms of politics and physical training, and a new flag was adopted for the united kingdom. The general election which followed was accompanied by severe intimidation, and most of the old political leaders boycotted the elections. As a result a legislature of nobodies was returned. As soon as the new Parliament met, in 1932, General Zhivkovitch resigned as having fulfilled his mandate to unite Jugoslavia and establish a settled constitution; Dr Marinkovitch succeeded him as Premier. It was not long, however, before an Opposition formed itself in the Lower House, some forty members organising a party hostile to the Government, whilst the old political leaders prepared to make a serious attempt to contest the next election. The electoral law was promptly amended to secure that the largest party at the polls should be ensured an overwhelming majority in Parliament, for the Opposition was so divided that it was unlikely that any single party would outnumber the Government supporters under the system of open voting. No general election was held until 1935,

when the Government polled something approaching double the votes of the Opposition parties; the allotment of seats gave 238 to the Government and sixty-seven to the Opposition. As a result the Opposition members for some time refused to take their seats.

The assassination of King Alexander in 1934 led to a marked change of policy. Under the ministries that followed that of Zhivkovitch, all opposition to the Government, both racial and democratic, had been violently suppressed; Belgrade University had been closed for months and its professors put under arrest, and even the leader of the little Mohammedan group—Dr Spaho—had been put in jail. The accession of the boy-king Peter II, who returned from his school in England, saw the establishment of a regency—arranged for in the late King's will—the presidency being entrusted to Prince Paul, a brother-in-law of the Princess Marina, Duchess of Kent. Prince Paul was far more moderate and conciliatory in his views than King Alexander had been, and in the next few months Dr Matchek was released from prison and an amnesty was granted to ten thousand political offenders. In 1936 the Chief Regent instituted negotiations with Dr Matchek for the attainment of a compromise on the great Croat problem. The more favourable political situation was, however, rudely interrupted by another shooting affair in Parliament; a member fired a revolver at the Prime Minister, Stoyadinovitch, whilst he was delivering his budget speech. No injuries were caused, and the would-be assassin was sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment.

In foreign policy, Jugoslavia naturally found herself ranged against her old enemies of the Great War—Hungary, Austria and Bulgaria, at whose expense she had so largely increased her area. Jugoslavia was therefore allied with Rumania and Czechoslovakia in the Little Entente. The Adriatic question had left a strong antipathy towards Italy, which found vent in a number of popular demonstrations of hostility in both countries. The murder of King Alexander, though perpetrated by a Croat, was believed to have been abetted by Hungary, and numbers of Magyars were deported from the north-western provinces during the latter part of 1934. As long as the Macedonian revolutionary bands were allowed to pursue their activities,¹ there was much friction with

¹ See p. 149.

Bulgaria, but with the suppression of these bands in 1935 a much more friendly attitude was observable, culminating in a treaty of friendship signed at Sofia at the end of 1936. Altogether, foreign problems were overshadowed by the serious situation in domestic politics, particularly by the Croat question. The future of Croatia and of parliamentary government in Jugoslavia was still problematical in 1937.

ALBANIA

The Albanian state owes its origin to the Balkan War of 1912. This collection of tribes, of mixed origin, of diverse religions, and of different dialects, living in somewhat primitive conditions among the mountain regions, adopted a ruler in the person of the German Prince William of Wied, with whom the Great Powers associated an international Commission of Control. During the crisis which preceded the outbreak of the Great War, Prince William gave up his rather uncomfortable and very insanitary throne, and the international Commission broke up. Disorder followed, centering round the attempt of one Essad Pasha to become king; then the Austro-Hungarian troops arrived, fresh from their conquest of Serbia, and they occupied the greater part of the country until the end of the Great War.

At the Paris peace conference the first idea about Albania was to divide it into three parts, extending Jugoslavia and Greece into the Albanian mountains and reserving a coast-strip on the Adriatic for Italy, which had secured a rather precarious foothold in Valona during the war. This scheme was frustrated by the strong opposition of President Wilson, and eventually an independent state was erected with much the same boundaries as the pre-war state. Meanwhile a national congress of tribesmen elected a Government, which established its capital at Tirana in 1920. Italy kept the island of Saseno and a couple of forts at the entrance to Valona harbour. The frontiers of the state were not finally delimited in detail until 1926, and it was during the mapping that there occurred the incident that sent Mussolini's fleet to bombard Corfu.

An election for a parliament was held early in 1921, the polls being accompanied by a good deal of racial disorder, fights with the Serb and Greek minorities being frequent. Both Greece and

Jugoslavia seemed likely to intervene with troops, and Albania appealed to the League of Nations to protect its integrity. The appeal was successful, and Jugoslavia contented herself with sending arms to a local chieftain named Marka Gjoni to enable him to set up a separate republic in the parts adjoining Serbia. The local tribes, however, did not take kindly to Marka Gjoni, and the little Mirdite Republic was suppressed by Albanian Government levies within a few days. The government of Albania was entrusted by Parliament to a Council of four Regents, each representing one of the four major religious followings in the country—two sects of Moslems, the Catholics and the Greek Church.

The politics of Albania were a mixture of tribal and personal feuds. From almost the beginning the personality of Ahmed Zogu dominated the political situation. His was the most important voice in the first Parliament, but the general election of 1924 saw his followers defeated in a stormy contest in which much violence occurred, Zogu himself being shot at and wounded and another candidate being killed. Already in 1922 there had been a small rebellion in the neighbourhood of the capital, but it had been put down. The 1924 election was followed by a recourse to arms by various defeated candidates in the far south and in the far north. In a confused welter of mountain fighting the opponents of Zogu at first got the best of it, and Zogu fled into Jugoslavia, whilst in the following weeks there was a wholesale flight of members of Parliament and candidates to escape into Greece and Italy. The fighting ended, however, in the victory of the Zogu faction; Ahmed Zogu returned from exile at the end of the year and, entering Tirana, established himself as President. Ignoring the results of the recent election, he recalled the old parliament, where he had been sure of a following.

Zogu's formal appointment as President of Albania in 1925 was for a period of seven years. Before the expiry of that time he had converted his presidency into a monarchy. In 1928 Parliament dissolved itself and summoned a constituent assembly to draw up a new Constitution. The new assembly quietly accepted every proposal made by the President, who before the end of the year was proclaimed as King Zogu. With a poor and mountainous country of less than two million inhabitants, Ahmed Zogu could do little in the way of constructive work. He did, however,

maintain a fair standard of order, and he set himself to eradicate as far as possible the traditional system of the vendetta which perpetuated strife in the families of those whose original quarrels had been almost forgotten. He also set himself to obtain fairer treatment of the poorer peasantry, imposing a kind of "Irish Land Act" on the Albanian landlords in 1930 and earmarking a third of the big estates for compulsory purchase in order to establish small-holders. It would have been miraculous in a country such as Albania if there had been no attempts at rebellion or assassination to remove the despot. In 1931 an attempt was made to murder him while on a visit to Vienna; in 1932 there were seven executions for treason and two hundred political arrests; in 1935 there was a small rebellion, which was easily suppressed. Plots and arrests continued to be reported all through 1936 and 1937. Like most Balkan rulers, King Zogu is enthroned on a volcano. He probably takes it as a matter of course.

Such industrial and commercial development as has taken place in Albania has been directed by Italian enterprise. Geographical proximity and intervention during the Great War have paved the way for this penetration. The Treaty of Tirana in 1926 granted Italy full opportunities for economic development in the country, and this was followed in 1927 by a military convention establishing an alliance. Should Albania fall from the grip of Ahmed Zogu and revert to tribal anarchy, Fascist Italy's economic interests and the possession of military and naval forces ready to hand will provide a great temptation to her to undertake something more than commercial penetration.

GREECE

The Kingdom of Hellas did not emerge from the war with such great territorial gains as were allotted to the other Balkan Allies. This was not because of the duplicity which had led King Constantine to withhold the aid which Greece had promised to her Serbian ally, but because there was a comparatively small area inhabited by Greeks outside the boundaries obtained by Hellas after the Balkan wars. There were small gains at the expense of Bulgaria and Albania and a larger advance of the frontier in Thrace, whilst a slice of Asia Minor round Smyrna was also allotted to her, the last two alterations being at the

expense of Turkey. This Smyrna province, with its awkward artificial frontier, extended to about seventy miles inland at its most easterly point, and arrangements were made for its administration by a separate parliament and for a plebiscite to decide its final status at the end of five years from 1919.

The Allies could probably have forced these arrangements on Turkey had they decided to finish off the Turkish treaty at the same time as those signed with the other allies of Germany. Turkey, in fact, was regarded as not merely a sick man but as a corpse, and it was proposed at Paris that her administration should be placed under mandate, the United States being suggested as the mandatory Power for at least part of her territory. During the negotiations with the United States the completion of the peace settlement was postponed, and in the interval the corpse sat up and began to hit out at the undertakers. Under the guidance of the able and unscrupulous Mustapha Kemal, who removed the Turkish Government from Constantinople to Angora, the Turks began to mass troops on the borders of the Smyrna province and to repudiate all suggestions of parting with the territory allotted to Greece. Meanwhile desperate fights broke out in the streets of Smyrna between the two races, Colonel Skina of the Greek army earning a sentence of penal servitude for the excessive enthusiasm with which he massacred inoffensive Turkish residents.

It was still generally believed that Turkish truculence had no weight behind it, and in 1920 a Greek army, with the approval of the Allies, advanced still farther into Turkey and occupied Brusa, near the Sea of Marmara, without serious opposition. Meanwhile a peace conference was summoned to meet in London early in 1921, the Government of Mustapha Kemal accepting the invitation to send representatives. To force the pace the Greek army soon afterwards began a great offensive which was expected to penetrate to the new capital at Angora. The advance was carried eastwards to more than half-way to Angora, Afium-Karahissar and Eskishehr being occupied by the Greeks. The Turks then vigorously counter-attacked and drove the Greeks back some fifty miles; reinforcements were hurried up from Smyrna and Brusa, and after a desperate conflict the southern wing of the Greek army re-entered Afium whilst, after a pitched battle at Kutaia, the northern wing drove the Turks behind the

river Sakaria, where the Ottoman forces managed to hold up the advance. A deadlock now set in, and the Greeks in 1922 made a diversion by landing a force at Rodosto to strike at Constantinople. The Allies now believed it possible to bring about a satisfactory peace and urged the Greeks to withhold their attacks; Greece thereupon stopped further offensive operations.

The Turks, meanwhile, had not been idle on their side. Strongly reinforced, Mustapha's armies began a great offensive in the summer of 1922, and the Greek forces began a retreat which was soon converted by the vigorous pursuit of the Turks into a veritable rout. By September the Greeks were hastily evacuating the military and civilians from the port of Smyrna and calling on the Allies to help them secure an armistice. This armistice was obtained only by handing over the greater part of the recent acquisitions in Thrace to complete the triumph of Mustapha. The Allies, in fact, were not prepared to undertake serious and expensive military operations to crush Turkey; Lloyd George wished Great Britain to restore the Greek rule in Smyrna, but Parliament refused to support this policy and Lloyd George fell from power. The peace conference of Lausanne, which met towards the end of 1922, was marked by obvious hesitation and dissension on the part of the Allies; in January 1923, peace terms restoring part of the lost Greek provinces were handed to the Turkish representatives, but on the same day France notified the Turkish Government that she was willing to modify these terms. Encouraged by this far from honest *démarche* on the part of France, the Turks rejected the proposals, and the final treaty, signed in July, left the whole of Asia Minor in Turkish hands and advanced the Turkish frontier in Thrace to the river Maritza.

The débâcle of the Turkish adventure had strong reactions on the stormy progress of domestic politics. At the close of the Great War, Hellas was ruled by King Alexander, the second son of the King Constantine who had been deposed by the Allies for his pro-German sympathies and his refusal to carry out his treaty obligations to Serbia. The Prime Minister was Eleutherios Venizelos, a veteran of Greek nationalism and democracy, who had been a consistent friend of the Allies throughout the war. The Parliament, which consisted of a single chamber, was that assembly which had returned a Venizelist and pro-Ally majority in 1915 and which, dissolved by the pro-German King in the follow-

ing year, had been recalled by Venizelos in 1917 after the deposition of "Tino". The minority members were still loyal to the ex-king and regarded Venizelos as a tyrannical dictator; bitter resentment was felt by their supporters against the forcible changing of the Greek Government by the Allied troops. While Venizelos was on a visit to Paris in 1920 a Constantinist tried to murder him; on his return to Athens, slightly wounded, Parliament voted him the saviour of Hellas and ordered a tablet in his honour to be placed in the House. Shortly afterwards King Alexander met with a death unique in the annals of royalty; while rescuing his dog from the attack of some monkeys in the palace grounds he received a bite which set up blood-poisoning, and the monkey's bite proved fatal. The Government offered the crown to Alexander's younger brother Paul, who showed no great readiness to accept it. Eventually he agreed to abide by the result of the coming general election, though he expressed a personal desire to see his father restored to the throne. Meanwhile Admiral Coundouriotis was appointed Regent and the throne remained in abeyance.

The result of the general election was a triumph for "Tino", whose supporters returned with a majority of more than two to one. Venizelos resigned and withdrew to France; Coundouriotis handed over the Regency to the dowager-queen Olga. King Constantine's restoration was confirmed by a plebiscite which gave him 99 per cent of the votes, and at the close of the year he returned with his eldest son George from his exile in Switzerland. A violent anti-Venizelist agitation began, leading to numerous outrages, including an attempt on the life of Admiral Coundouriotis.

The happy return of King Constantine was of rather brief duration. Within two years most of the people who had voted so enthusiastically for his restoration were clamouring for his expulsion. It was the Smyrna débâcle that overthrew him. The Gounaris Ministry shared with the King the odium of the failure. Towards the end of 1922 the garrison of Salonika revolted; other troops joined in the movement, and King Constantine abdicated in favour of his eldest son George. Theodore Zaimis became Prime Minister and signalled his administration by surrendering to the most vindictive demands of the Opposition. "Tino" was expelled from the country; the leading members of the previous

Cabinet were sent to trial on charges of criminal neglect of the Turkish war. They were found guilty, and six of them were executed, including the ex-premier Gounaris. The British ambassador asked for his passports in disgust.

King George II had been so closely identified with his father's fortunes that the logical sequel to Constantine's second exile seemed to be his removal, whether followed by the establishment of Prince Paul on the throne or by the proclamation of a republic. The Venizelists now demanded the latter solution of the question, and all through the year 1923 the matter was discussed in all circles, and not without heat. The garrison of Corinth rose against King George in October, and was suppressed by Government troops; the royalists rioted in Athens, many people being killed. In December a general election was held: it resulted in the return of an overwhelming republican majority, only thirty seats out of four hundred being royalist. King George was immediately expelled: his father Constantine had died during the year in Italy. Venizelos returned from France early in 1924, but he was a sick man. Restored as Prime Minister, his health compelled him to resign almost at once, after a collapse on the floor of the House. Under his successor Kaphandaris an exaggerated controversy broke out over the question whether the proclamation of the Republic should be made dependent on a plebiscite. Kaphandaris favoured a preliminary plebiscite; the army set up a violent agitation against this and Kaphandaris resigned. His successor Papanastasiou effected a compromise; he declared the dynasty deposed, and then held the plebiscite. Meanwhile Venizelos, still in very bad health, had gone back to France in disgust at the quarrels among the republican leaders. The plebiscite of 1924 gave a more than two to one majority for the Republic.

For the next eleven years Hellas was a Republic. Admiral Coundouriotis became President, with Papanastasiou as Premier. The course of Greek politics, however, ran no more smoothly under the republican regime. In 1925 a military revolution in Athens established General Pangalos as dictator; Parliament was dissolved, martial law was proclaimed, and the Government assumed the power of legislation by decree: a new Constitution was drawn up and a Parliament was promised for the following year. The new Government gave a proof of its superiority to the old one by decreeing the death-penalty against peculators in the

civil service—and by hanging two of them although their offence had been committed before the new decree had increased the penalty. It also showed its desire for economical administration by suppressing the Ministry of National Economy. The next step of Pangalos was to assume the presidency, after harrying Admiral Coundouriotis into resignation. A plebiscite to confirm this change was carried in favour of the Government after a good deal of coercion. A censorship of the Press was also established.

Then came a sudden change. It was a military rising that had set up the dictatorship in 1925; it was a military rising that overthrew it in 1926. The first outbreak at Salonika was put down; the second, in Athens, was successful. Coundouriotis was restored to the presidency, and Pangalos went to jail. The Pangalists promptly raised an insurrection of those regiments that had been supporters of the dictator, and a brief civil war raged round Athens. When the Pangalist rebels had been defeated, a general election was held; seats were distributed on the principle of proportional representation and a Senate was added to Parliament, as it was believed that the Government would obtain greater success from this system, whilst as an additional precaution no Pangalist was allowed to stand as candidate. The result showed a republican majority of sixteen in a House of 274.

During the next nine years there was no rebellion, though there was plenty of plotting, and a good deal of political violence. Venizelos returned to Greece in 1927, and next year re-entered politics. He persuaded the President to dissolve Parliament and to abolish the proportional representation system by decree. In the ensuing general election he secured a nine to one majority. Meanwhile General Pangalos had been released from prison. In 1929 Admiral Coundouriotis, who had just escaped assassination two years before, when he was slightly wounded, resigned owing to ill-health, and Theodore Zaimis became President. In 1930 General Pangalos was arrested again for plotting, and was sent to prison for two years. The opposition to Venizelos was now rather within his own party than among royalists and Pangalists, and at the election of 1932 the new "Popular" party came within six seats of Venizelos' "Liberals" and, by allying with other Opposition groups, turned him out of office. This result was aided by a return to proportional representation, which it was believed would safeguard the republican régime against the

royalists. The Tsaldaris Government which succeeded Venizelos had no majority behind it, and another election was held in the following year. This time the "Populists" obtained a clear majority of fourteen. An attempt of General Plastiras to establish himself as dictator in 1933 fizzled out after a small party of malcontents had seized a few Government offices in Athens: Plastiras fled the country. The affair was followed by much washing of dirty linen in public; Venizelos was accused of having fomented the conspiracy, his car was chased across the Attic plain by assassins who failed to hit him and a member of Parliament moved his impeachment. Tsaldaris, the Prime Minister, eventually persuaded the House to vote a complete amnesty for all political offenders. In 1934 the Greek Parliament became the scene of violent altercations in which various missiles were used to reinforce the arguments; then the Opposition seceded from the House and remained aloof for some months.

In 1934 Venizelos, whose life—like that of many political personages in Greece—was constantly in danger, retired to his native island of Crete. Next year a rebellion broke out in Athens and in Macedonia, whilst the fleet mutinied and went off to Crete to hail Venizelos as leader. The risings on land having been sternly suppressed, the fleet decided to surrender, and Venizelos fled to France. Three military officers were executed after this rebellion and nearly a thousand were expelled from the army. Parliamentary politics remained stormy, and were varied by a dispute between the two Houses, which ended in the Lower House declaring the Senate to be abolished. There followed a general election, in which five of the parties refused to take part. The "Populists" returned with a majority of about five to one. Political life in Greece was by now almost hopelessly discredited, and a few weeks after this election Tsaldaris came to the decision that the Republic was a failure. Making arrangements for a plebiscite on the restoration of the monarchy, he resigned the premiership to General Kondylis. Following the precedent of 1924, Parliament proclaimed the Monarchy before the holding of the plebiscite, and President Zaimis resigned his post, Kondylis taking the title of Regent. The result of the plebiscite in November 1935 was to give 97 per cent of the votes to the King, and before the end of the year George II had returned to his capital.

King George began his second reign with a comprehensive

amnesty for all political offenders, much to the mortification of Kondylis. A general election followed in 1936, returning a House so evenly balanced between conflicting groups that the formation of a stable Government was well-nigh impossible. The sudden death of two premiers in succession—Kondylis and Demerdjis—led to the establishment of General Metaxas as Prime Minister. Metaxas tried to solve the parliamentary difficulty by securing the appointment of a committee of forty members to whom the House delegated its powers during a long adjournment. Then a series of strikes and economic disturbances, largely fomented by Communists, led to the proclamation of martial law and the suspension of the Constitution, all the fifteen Communist members of Parliament being arrested. The year 1936 ended with Greece under the dictatorship of General Metaxas, supported by King George. During the year Eleutherios Venizelos died in Paris at the age of seventy-one.

Amidst the confusing welter of Greek politics the general condition of the country had made little progress. Financial administration was bad and marked by some scandals, and the corruption of some political leaders was one of the factors leading to a discrediting of parliamentary institutions. Even before the world economic crisis Greece was suffering from serious financial difficulties, and in 1927 a League of Nations loan was obtained, though only to the extent of £9,000,000. The world crisis brought great suffering to Greece, where there was soon a marked shortage of supplies. In 1932 the Government decreed three meatless days a week. In this year, too, the Government was unable to meet the interest charges on its debt, and a partial default ensued. Only 30 per cent of the interest could be raised, and this default became chronic, the proportion of payments rising only to 40 per cent by 1936. Negotiations for a second League loan broke down in 1932. Some signs of recuperation appeared in 1933, and the new autocratic Government of General Metaxas announced a fairly wide programme of national reconstruction and improvement, including the bringing of labour conditions up to western standards. Health insurance, the protection of juvenile workers, a minimum wage and compulsory arbitration in labour disputes were all foreshadowed. With such limited financial resources, however, the task of reform appeared to be a very difficult one.

Greek foreign policy was not dominated by that anxiety to safeguard the retention of Versailles acquisitions that was so conspicuous a feature of the policy of neighbouring states. The Greek territorial gains had been mostly wiped out by the Turkish war. Greece reconciled herself to the loss of these transitory acquisitions with remarkable ease. There were long negotiations for the mutual exchange of minority populations across the frontiers, and in this task the League of Nations played a conspicuously useful part. Over a million Greeks were brought from various parts of the Ottoman dominions and settled—mainly in rural areas—in Greece, the Government making large grants in aid of these refugees. Turks were similarly transferred to their own country. This task of mutual exchange was not completed until 1932. The job was done thoroughly, and the divorce of the Greek population from the disputed territories led to a melting away of the desire for Greek expansion into lands that had formerly been coveted. In 1930 a friendly treaty was negotiated between Turkey and Greece, and this was strengthened by another in 1933. In 1934 Greece joined with Jugoslavia, Rumania and Turkey in the Balkan Pact, recognising the existing distribution of territory in the Balkan peninsula.

With Bulgaria relations were not so friendly, for Bulgaria was smarting under the double loss of territory due to the results of the Balkan war of 1913 and the Great War. In 1925 a frontier incident almost led to war; exchange of shots between sentries resulted in four Greek soldiers being killed, and when Bulgaria rejected Greece's demand for a heavy indemnity Greek troops marched in force into Bulgaria. The League of Nations scored one of its few successes in the prevention of war by intervening, on the request of Bulgaria, and the Greeks not only withdrew their invading army but paid compensation for their hasty act of aggression.

There was some ill-feeling against Italy on account of her retention of the islands of the Dodekanese, which she had occupied during the Tripoli war against the Turks in 1911. In 1920, however, Italy agreed to hand over to Greece all the islands except Rhodes, and a plebiscite on the future of this island was promised in the unlikely contingency of Britain ceding Cyprus to Greece. A serious breach with Italy occurred in 1923. During the mapping of the new Albanian boundary by the League of Nations Com-

missioners, a party of five Italians, including General Tellini, were murdered by brigands whilst on Greek soil. Mussolini resolved to assert the power of the new Fascist state and at once demanded the punishment of the assassins and the payment of more than £500,000 as compensation. Greece tried to meet these demands half-way, but definitely refused the compensation proposals. The Italian fleet then proceeded to bombard the port of Corfu, where fifteen persons were killed and many wounded; Italian forces went on to occupy the islands of Corfu, Paxos and Samothrace. After much fluttering of the diplomats at Geneva, both sides in the dispute agreed to submit the compensation question to the Hague Court, though Mussolini secured the handing over of the full sum as a guarantee that Greece would pay if worsted at the Hague. The Court was unable to establish the identity of the assassins, but inflicted the full fine on Greece. The general impression given by these events was far from favourable to the League of Nations, and world opinion felt that Italy had put herself out of court by her acts of military aggression. Since that time relations with Italy have remained outwardly friendly, but memories of Corfu and alarm at Italian economic penetration of Albania have prevented Italo-Greek relations from becoming cordial.

Greece, in fact, has been too poor and too much absorbed in her domestic politics to show much concern with foreign policy. There was a keen sympathy with the Cypriot agitation against British rule, but the Government refused to take official action in the matter for fear of alienating a Power that had usually shown itself sympathetic to Greece. In a crude stage of economic development, judged by modern standards, and still infested with the plague of brigandage, Hellas seemed to lie in a backwater of European politics. Her leaders were content to attain the standard of Ypsilanti, Kanaris and Capo d'Istrias rather than that of Pericles, Solon and Demosthenes.

BULGARIA

The Great War left the Kingdom of Bulgaria in the position of a gambler who has staked his shirt and his vest on horses that have lost. The first Balkan war had offered the opportunity of large territorial gains; Bulgaria thought she could get still more by

fighting her former allies, and she got roundly beaten as a result. The losses inflicted on Bulgaria by the Treaty of Bucharest of 1913 could be at any rate partly compensated by the opportunities presented by the great European war. King Ferdinand watched the situation closely and negotiated with both sides; probably the Allies could have obtained his help if they had been willing to coerce Serbia into ceding part of Macedonia to him, but they failed to do so, and Ferdinand joined the Central Powers. At first all went well; Bulgarian armies, co-operating with the Austro-Hungarian forces, overran large areas in Serbia and Rumania. Then came the crash; "Foxy Ferdie" went into exile in Switzerland, and the Treaty of Neuilly left Bulgaria smaller than before its intervention in the Great War and with a population less than that of London.

The little state was helpless in the midst of its inflated neighbours. All it could do was to nurse its resentment and hold an inquest on the miscalculation of policy which had brought the nation into this plight. The question of the impeachment and punishment of the Ministers responsible for Bulgaria's alliance with Germany was a topic of controversy for several years. There were twenty-two of these Ministers, and a referendum was held in 1922 to decide whether they should be brought to trial. The decision was in the affirmative, but the development of more up-to-date controversies caused the business to be postponed, and interest in the subject gradually died out.

At the general election to the single-chamber parliament in 1919 the Agrarian party returned as the largest political group, the Communists coming second among the many parties, with 47 seats out of a total of 237. The political situation was confused; the Agrarians, led by Stamboliski, took office, and in the following spring another general election increased the Agrarian representation to nearly half the House. The Opposition was led by the Communists, who drew their main strength from the urban constituencies, and political strife took a very disorderly and violent form. In 1921 Dimitroff, one of the Ministers, was assassinated; in 1922 the leading Communist members of Parliament were put under arrest. In 1923 a general election, accompanied by much terrorism and coercion, gave the Agrarians the triumphant result of 212 seats as against 30 for the Opposition. No sooner had the result been announced than a revolt broke out

in Sofia under Opposition but non-Communist direction. The capital was seized by the rebels, and Stamboliski, retiring into the country to raise the Agrarian forces, was followed up and assassinated. A Government under Professor Tsankoff was installed at Sofia, and had at once to face a Communist rebellion, which was put down with great severity. A fresh general election was ordered; this time the new Government obtained 202 seats and the new Opposition only 45. In no part of the Balkans was the electorate more susceptible to Government coercion than in Bulgaria.

Professor Tsankoff's Government adopted a policy of severity to its opponents, a policy which became intensified with the retaliatory violence of the Communists. Murders and bomb-throwing became prevalent in the towns, culminating in 1925 in an attempt to assassinate King Boris and the wrecking of Sofia Cathedral by a Communist bomb which killed 120 people. This outrage led to the proclamation of a "state of siege", the arrest of thousands of malcontents and numerous sentences of imprisonment and death. Tsankoff's severities provoked opposition even among his own supporters, and in 1926 he resigned, giving place to Liaptchoff, a somewhat more moderate man, who succeeded in retaining the premiership for five years.

Bulgarian parliamentary democracy presented all the weaknesses displayed in the other Balkan countries, but in an even greater degree. There was not only a good deal of corruption and jobbery, but the position of member of Parliament was an object of ambition to large numbers of men who considered it a good means of getting substantial pay for doing little or no work. At the general election of 1927 there were no less than forty thousand candidates for the 273 seats. In none of the Balkan states was it more certain that the Government in power at the time of the elections would secure an ample majority. Coercion of voters was open, and there were allegations of wholesale gerrymandering of ballot-papers. In spite of sure Government victories at elections, parliamentary debates were often stormy; personal feuds were added to political animosities. Even in matters of culture controversies were carried to excess. When in 1921 certain newspapers refused to adapt their type to a statutory revision of the alphabet, continuing to print the three "redundant" letters that Parliament had abolished, the offending journals were suppressed.

Political assassinations were frequent, and rival factions fought out their feuds in the streets of the capital, even under the very windows of the royal palace. Communism adopted the most violent methods, which were equalled in the activities of the Macedonian patriots whose one aim was to secure the liberation of their old homes from Jugoslav rule. Behind the political scenes, camarillas of officers plotted and pulled the wires in the approved style of Balkan romances.

Meanwhile the finances of Bulgaria were in confusion. The exchange of minority populations with Greece brought a host of refugees who were penniless and full of grievances. Like Greece, Bulgaria applied to the League of Nations for assistance in this matter, and in 1926 a League loan was issued to assist in settling the refugees on the land. A second more general loan was issued two years later. In spite of this assistance the financial situation remained bad, and in 1932 Bulgaria made partial default on the interest. A settlement with the League was, however, effected in 1933, and the payment of interest was resumed.

The activities of the Macedonian patriots were a constant source of trouble both to Bulgaria and her western neighbour. Led by Mihailoff, a "king of the brigands" from Petrich, across the Rhodope mountains, the I.M.R.O.—the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation—divided its attention between raiding Jugoslavia and murderous internal disputes. There were riots at Kustendil as early as 1922, and in 1927 there were numerous petty raids across the western frontier, accompanied by much looting and some murders. On the vigorous protest of the Jugoslav Government Liaptcheff proclaimed martial law in the frontier districts, but little was done to suppress the movement, the Minister of War—General Volkoff—being known to strongly sympathise with it. By this time the I.M.R.O. was distracted by the feud between the supporters of Mihailoff and his rival Protogeroff. In the year 1928 alone this feud was responsible for more than three hundred murders. Even after the assassination of Protogeroff the two factions continued their murderous strife. In 1929 General Volkoff went to Rome as ambassador, and the Government then took some steps to curb the Macedonians. A few notorious murderers were arrested, and in 1930 after a direct threat of war from Jugoslavia, orders were issued for the arrest of the leaders of both the factions. As usual, however, the results

of the "round-up" were poor, only a few of the minor fry being secured. The frontier raids and internal feuds continued, and even increased in boldness until the military revolution of 1934, when for the first time really serious steps were taken to crush this lawless movement.

At the general election of 1931 the Liaptcheff combination of groups, somewhat to the general surprise, failed to retain its majority. A new Government took office, calling itself the "Government of National Union", and headed first by Malinoff and after his illness and retirement by Mushanoff. Thirty-three Communists obtained election, and in the following year the Communists secured a majority at the elections for the municipal Council of Sofia. A series of violent debates ended in 1933 with the expulsion of the Communists from both Parliament and the Sofia Council, and numerous arrests were made. Sixteen Communist leaders were condemned to death. Martial law was proclaimed in the capital, this measure being aimed as much at the Macedonian firebrands as at the Communists. The "Government of National Union", however, did not satisfy the military leaders, who now began to take a more open part in politics. In 1928 Colonel Veltcheff had founded an Officers' League, and this was later extended into the "Zveno", a society for the reform of government. In 1934 a military revolution took place in Sofia. Parliament was dissolved, all political parties were declared abolished, and a new Government was set up under Gheorgieff, with Veltcheff as the man behind the throne.

The military Government gave promise of genuine reform; for the first time serious steps were taken against the Macedonians; numerous arrests were effected, and the great Mihaloff fled to Turkey. But as time went on it became apparent that the new Government installed by the Zveno was remarkable only for the strength of the blows it struck at its opponents. During the year 1934 fifty Communists were sentenced to death. Then the usual quarrels broke out among the dominant party. King Boris had all along regarded the military *coup* with disfavour, and in 1935 Colonel Veltcheff was suddenly arrested and martial law was proclaimed. Two hundred persons belonging to the "Veltcheff faction" were put in prison. At the end of the year Veltcheff and some of his chief supporters were brought to trial and sentence of death was imposed, this being commuted, however, to imprisonment.

ment. In 1936 the Military League was dissolved by royal decree, and a general election was promised for the month of October. The election was then postponed, and at the beginning of 1937 the future system of government in Bulgaria was "in the air". In spite of the formal dissolution of the Zveno, the army leaders were very strong, and it was held that in the political sphere "anything might happen".

Bulgaria after the Great War was too weak and too poor to indulge in a very vigorous foreign policy. Surrounded by hostile states that had helped themselves to former Bulgarian territory, all she could do was to angle for whatever support she could get from more distant Powers. Frontier incidents brought about tension with Greece and Jugoslavia; the exchange of shots between sentries led to the Greek invasion of 1925, from which Bulgaria was saved by the League of Nations.¹ The raids of the I.M.R.O. on several occasions brought Bulgaria and Jugoslavia to the verge of war. The Bulgarians drew what comfort they could from the friendship of Turkey and Italy. Relations with Jugoslavia improved somewhat after 1933, when a Bulgaro-Jugoslav Society was founded to promote peace and cultural relations between the two peoples. Bulgaria was invited to join the Balkan Pact of 1934, and thus come into line with Greece, Jugoslavia, Rumania and Turkey to preserve peace and solidarity among the Balkan peoples, but as this Pact involved a recognition of the permanence of existing boundaries Bulgaria could not bring herself to sign it. In days gone by, Russia had been a great champion and protector of the Bulgarians, but the relations between the Bulgarian Governments and the Communist party were such as to preclude any great sympathy from this quarter. Bulgaria remained a political Jonah, and its population of six millions was left to assert its vigour in internal strife.

RUMANIA

By the peace treaties the area of Rumania was more than doubled, and her population was increased from seven millions to seventeen millions. It seemed at first doubtful whether the entire area allotted to her would be actually secured, since the Bolshevik revolutions in Russia and Hungary threatened to spread their

¹ See p. 145.

influence over the adjacent parts of the new Rumania. The local Bessarabian Diet voted for union with Rumania at the close of 1918, and a meeting of German-speaking Transylvanians passed a similar vote early in 1919, but nearly a third of the Bessarabians were akin to the Russians in race, and a large minority of the Transylvanians were Magyars. Bela Kun boldly invaded Transylvania, but the Rumanian army defeated him and dictated a peace in Budapest, retiring heavily laden with plunder in the form of food supplies and transport material. Russia might have proceeded to invade Bessarabia had the Polish war proved successful, but after the retreat from Warsaw and the Treaty of Riga the Bolshevik Government accepted the new frontiers in the west, though the constitution of the Soviet Union left it open for Bessarabia to unite with a tiny autonomous republic established on the Russian side of the border.

Rumanian politics had for long been notorious for their corruption, though there had been less revolution and violence than in the other Balkan countries. The dominant party was known as the Liberal party, though in 1920 it amalgamated with other groups under the name of the "People's party" and won a decisive victory at the elections, the opposition consisting mainly of the Peasants' party and the racial groups from the new provinces. In this year a bomb was exploded in the Senate, killing a Minister and a bishop; the authorship of the crime was unknown. There was another election in 1922, at which there were such serious charges of corruption and falsification of returns that the Opposition refused to take their seats. This secession remained almost continuous until the formulation of a new Constitution in 1925, when the Opposition spent its time between violent obstruction and renewed secession. While granting universal suffrage and proportional representation, the system proposed included a provision by which the party securing the largest number of votes at a general election should have a majority of seats in Parliament. The first elections under this system were fixed for 1926.

The leading personalities in Rumanian politics were the Bratianu brothers, under whose direction the peace treaties had been negotiated. The elder Bratianu had resigned the premiership on failing to obtain a still larger increase of territory than that allotted by the Allies, but he remained the dominant influence with the Cabinet, though he did not return to the premiership until 1924.

Meanwhile—after a brief interval under Vaida-Voevod—General Averescu was Prime Minister, and after a severe Government defeat in the municipal elections of 1926 the General took the helm again, the Bratianus retiring from open control of the Cabinet. Under the nominal direction of Averescu, with the Bratianus as the controlling influence, the first elections under the new Constitution resulted in the return of 292 Government candidates as against an Opposition of 85. Bratianu then quarrelled with Averescu, whom he considered to be getting too independent, and in 1927 Bratianu took the premiership once more. A new general election confirmed the Government in power by the usual overwhelming majority, but was followed by the death of Ion Bratianu, his brother Vintila succeeding him in office.

During the ten years after the armistice the Government had maintained—with one brief interval—the system of martial law introduced under war conditions. The police attained an unenviable reputation for brutality and corruption. Elections were known to be consistently manipulated by every kind of unfair and fraudulent device. Every now and then some major scandal would rouse public opinion against the rulers of the country, the most famous of these affairs being the passport scandal of 1924. To evade the severe immigration laws of the United States, General Vaitoianu had evolved a scheme for issuing passports to peasants as nominally “agents” of a Rumanian oil company, and these special passports were issued to applicants only in return for heavy bribes. Large numbers of peasants who had invested their savings in these documents and in their passage money, were taken under Government supervision to France, where they were left to look after themselves, though a few were conveyed across the Atlantic, not to the United States but to Cuba or Venezuela. The release of the General after his arrest in connection with this sordid business was generally believed to be due to corrupt Government influence. There were also scandals in connection with the administration of the agrarian law of 1921, under which the State bought up large estates and split them into small holdings for which peasants could pay by instalments.

In 1928 popular discontent had reached fever heat. A huge meeting of peasants to protest against the iniquities of the Government was held at Alba Iulia, and though the Government tried to upset it by putting obstacles in the way of railway facilities, it

was attended by close on 100,000 persons. The meeting was followed by the arrest of numerous journalists for reporting the proceedings in a sense unfavourable to the Government. In Parliament the discontent was focussed in the Peasants' party, led by the calm and astute Dr Maniu, who succeeded in frustrating the Government's intention of obtaining a foreign loan by declaring that any such loan would be flatly repudiated by the Peasants' party should they attain power; foreign capitalists were scared, and the loan was refused. Soon the Regents who were acting in the name of the boy-king Michael advised Vintila Bratianu that he was losing his last shreds of support in the country, and when the Premier offered to resign they accepted his suggestion, much to his surprise. Dr Maniu was appointed Prime Minister, and a general election was ordered. Before the election of 1928 Maniu abolished martial law, terminated the censorship of the Press that had become a normal feature of Rumanian politics, and dismissed several thousands of the hated police. The elections were a tremendous victory for the Peasants' party, which returned 333 members, as against 54 for other groups; Bratianu's Liberals were reduced in numbers from 293 to 13.

The Maniu Government, which had begun so well, and which in 1929 effected considerable economies and succeeded in obtaining a loan through the good offices of the League of Nations, soon degenerated into much the condition of its predecessor. The police resumed their terrorist activities against opponents of the Government and against strikers; after the attempted assassination of a member of the Cabinet, a quite innocent Jew was flogged and bastinadoed nearly to death. A new censorship law was passed in 1930. Meanwhile the world economic crisis hit Rumania, and King Carol intervened to construct a national Government that would be above party considerations. Maniu was dismissed, and a non-party Government was formed under Mironescu, which in 1931 gave place to a "cabinet of personalities" formed by King Carol under the premiership of Jorga, the most active "personality" being Argetoianu, the Minister of Finance. A general election in that year gave the new "Party of National Union" only 48 per cent of the votes cast, but as the largest single party the Government was allotted 197 out of the 387 seats. There were the usual charges of election manipulation and fraud.

This intervention of the Crown in parliamentary politics was the culmination of a controversy that had surrounded the position of Carol for a dozen years. When the war came to an end, Ferdinand, nephew of Carol I, was King of Rumania, and in 1922 he was crowned King of Greater Rumania at Alba Julia in Transylvania, where Michael the Brave had been crowned in days gone by. The Crown Prince Carol had married a former actress named Madame Lupescu, but the marriage was not recognised as legal, and the prince then intended to retire into private life, formally renouncing his claims to the throne in 1919. Two years later, however, King Ferdinand persuaded his son to return to the palace and to marry the Princess Helen of Greece, by whom he had a son Michael. Not long after this marriage Carol again abandoned his official position and went abroad to join Madame Lupescu, making a second renunciation of the throne in 1925. This was the position when King Ferdinand died in 1927. Carol announced that he was prepared to be King if the people wanted him, but this message was suppressed by a strict censorship of the Rumanian newspapers, and the Bratianus proclaimed the infant Michael as King; he was then five years old. A Commission of Regency was appointed, consisting of the late King's brother Nicholas, the Chief Judge of Rumania, and the Patriarch of the Rumanian branch of the Greek Church. There was a considerable section of the public, however, that sympathised with Carol, and when the ex-minister Manolescu was arrested and put on trial before a court-martial for introducing letters and manifestoes from the exiled prince, there was so great an outcry that the prisoner was acquitted. During the next twelvemonth Carol alienated many of his supporters by injudicious conduct, particularly by appealing for support among the Magyar minority in Transylvania. During this year the Princess Helen divorced him, and the British Home Office requested him to leave England on account of his political activities against the Government of Rumania. The economic crisis, however, gave Carol his chance, and in 1930 he suddenly returned to Bucharest, where many of the army officers declared in his favour. After a brief negotiation with the Regents and the Cabinet, Carol was accepted as king, and his little son retired from the throne, being given the title of Prince of Alba Julia. Carol was now thirty-seven years of age.

King Carol's experiment of a non-party Government under his own supervision was not a success. Jorga insisted on economies in the pay of civil servants; the King would not agree to these, and Jorga resigned. At the general election which ensued, in 1932, the Peasants' party headed the list, with 45 per cent of the votes, and—according to the system of the Constitution—was allotted 277 seats out of 387. The "National Union" candidates secured only five seats, and had little support in the country. The new Peasants' Party Government, which soon restored Dr Maniu to the premiership, carried through economies in the higher ranks of the civil service, and obtained a further League loan at the price of establishing the control of League Commissioners over the country's finances in 1933. Another general election in 1933 witnessed a swing of the political pendulum in favour of the Liberal party, which obtained 300 seats.

The economic crisis and discontent with the pettiness and corruption of parliamentary politics provoked the rise of a movement of Fascist or Nazi character, mainly among the army officers. There arose an organisation called the "Iron Guard", which specialised in Jew-baiting; anti-Semitism was strong in certain parts of Rumania, and in 1930 there had been serious anti-Jew riots in the Bukovina. During 1931 the "National Union" Government had forbidden the meetings of any but the regular parliamentary parties, and the succeeding Governments maintained this attitude towards both the Iron Guard members and the Communists, who were at first strong only in Bessarabia on the Russian frontier, though by 1933 there was a considerable Communist organisation in the capital. When a young student murdered the Liberal premier Duca, who had taken office after the elections of 1933, his successor Tatarescu enforced martial law in nine towns, including the capital, and arrested Iron Guard and Communists indiscriminately. A new press censorship law was passed in 1934, and Parliament granted the Government emergency decree powers during the recess, subject to confirmation by Parliament on its reassembly. To relieve the continuing crisis, a subsidy was granted to pay half the debts of the farming community, and industrial prices were made subject to Government regulation. Nevertheless, anti-Semitic riots broke out sporadically in Bucharest and elsewhere throughout the years 1934 and 1935.

The Iron Guard continued to carry on its political activities;

in 1936 it was formally suppressed, but continued to function under another name. There were also two new organisations of Fascist type now in evidence, Professor Cuza's "Christian League" and a "National Christian Party" which displayed their Christianity mainly by intensified propaganda against the Jews. The Government in 1936 forbade all political uniforms and the drilling of political organisations. Numerous Communists were also consigned to prison. Rumania presented the spectacle of a nation that had never known any but coercive Governments and corrupt administration, and showed no sign of developing any party that paid more than lip-service to the ideals of honesty and efficiency. League control of the national finances terminated in 1935. The new parties were violent, destructive in their policies and composed mainly of very inferior men. King Carol, as a generally popular sovereign who was trying to do his best for the people, remained the only element of stability in the governmental system.

In foreign policy, Rumania naturally inclined to the alliance of those states that had become enriched by the partition of the Habsburg monarchy, and she entered the Little Entente with Czecho-Slovakia and Jugoslavia in 1920. The Balkan Pact—a somewhat similar non-aggression treaty which, though disappointing some Turkish aims, confirmed the spoliation of Bulgaria—was signed in 1934, Rumania becoming a member. A pact of non-aggression with Russia, after nearly reaching fruition in 1932, was signed in 1934. There was a dispute with Germany in 1925 over the failure of the German Republican Government to redeem the notes issued by the Kaiser's armies during the military occupation; in retaliation for this repudiation, German property in Rumania was confiscated and a supertax of 25 per cent was imposed on German imports. An Act of 1924 making it necessary for 60 per cent of the capital in any new industrial enterprise to be Rumanian, and requiring a Rumanian majority on the Board of Directors, was aimed at the great foreign interests—largely British and American—in the country. Yet with chaotic politics, League control of its finances, and lack of native industrial enterprise, Rumania remained heavily dependent on foreign capital.

POLAND

The Republic of Poland was the largest of the "new" countries added to the map of Europe by the Versailles settlement. In the old days the Kingdom of Poland had occupied an important position on the map, but for the century preceding the Great War its territories had remained under the rule of the Powers that had carried out the famous partitions of the eighteenth century. National feeling had remained strong through the generations, and it was one of President Wilson's great aims to restore independence to this extensive European people. Under the Versailles Treaty large parts of the former Russian Empire, Germany, and Austria-Hungary were united into a Polish state. This large country, with a population approaching thirty millions, was poor and backward in comparison with the western states; its peasantry—especially in the area formerly ruled by Russia—were wretchedly poor and generally illiterate. The middle class was small and of recent growth, and the industrial development was limited to a few large cities. Business enterprise, large and small, was to a great degree in the hands of Jews; the bulk of the people professed the Roman Catholic religion.

On the collapse of the Central Empires a national Government was set up in Warsaw by Moraczewski and General Pilsudski, whilst in the former Austrian parts the Socialist Daszynski organised a separate Government at Cracow. Negotiations between the two Governments led to the holding of elections for an all-Poland assembly, adult suffrage being established. Meanwhile the Warsaw Government appointed Pilsudski as provisional President of Poland and Paderewski, who had supported the claims of the Poles at the Paris Conference, as Prime Minister. Of the 500 members elected, some 400 held a mandate to support the existing Government; there was a Socialist party of 80 and a small Jewish party. During the year 1919 the National Assembly was busy drawing up a Constitution, which established universal suffrage for both sexes and a Parliament of two Houses, with a President elected for a seven years term of office. The exact boundaries of the new state took a long time to fix, and the Poles were much irritated by the secrecy observed by the "Big Five"—the dominant Powers of the Paris Conference—in the discussions on the future of Poland. There was much talk about the "Curzon line"—an

eastern boundary suggested by the British Foreign Minister—but the exact position of this line remained a mystery to the peoples most concerned until halfway through the year 1920.

Meanwhile circumstances arose which seemed to threaten the Curzon line with extinction. Fresh from their triumph over the "white" armies of the Russian Conservatives, the Moscow Bolsheviks hurled their armies westwards against the Poles and the little Baltic states. The Russian attack was by no means unprovoked, for Poland had taken advantage of the confusion in western Russia to send troops across Lithuania as far as Dvinsk and to ally with the independent Ukrainian Government, Polish forces taking part in the seizure of Kiev from the Bolsheviks. In the summer of 1920 the whole weight of the Russian armies was concentrated on Poland, and the Polish troops were soon in headlong retreat. By the end of July the Bolsheviks were in Pinsk and Grodno, whilst farther south a Russian column had penetrated as far as the old Austrian province of Galicia. Panic set in at Warsaw, and an urgent appeal for help was sent to the Allies, who tried to negotiate an armistice. Meanwhile France sent large quantities of munitions to Warsaw along with a staff of expert military advisers headed by General Weygand. The Russian advance continued; Brest-Litovsk fell, and the invading army reached Okuniev, within a dozen miles of the Polish capital. The Bolsheviks brought with them their peace terms, which they considered generous enough to command support among a large section of Polish opinion: Poland was to be given an even more favourable eastern frontier than that of the Curzon line, which had just been made public, but Poland must establish the Soviet system, accept a limitation on its armed forces, entrust these armed forces to Trade Union control, and pay a large indemnity.

On 14 August the counter-offensive planned by Pilsudski and Weygand¹ was launched. The main plan was to deliver a surprise onslaught in force on the wings of the Russian advance, and then to swing round behind the central Russian army that was nearing Warsaw and crush it. The plan was carried out with remarkable success. By the end of August the Russians were pouring back into Lithuania, and the total Bolshevik losses of the retreat exceeded 100,000, whilst 30,000 fled over the German frontier and were interned. These losses were due largely to the insubordination

¹ Weygand modestly attributed the whole plan to Pilsudski.

of the Russian General Budenny who, instead of covering the retreat as ordered, tried to divert the pursuit by making an invasion of Galicia; the result was to leave his own force isolated and at the mercy of the victorious Poles. The Moscow Government admitted defeat. In October the Treaty of Riga gave Poland an eastern boundary which added nearly 50 per cent to the territory allotted to her by the Curzon line; it also gave her some six million Russian subjects in the eastern frontier provinces.

The cancellation of the Curzon line was not altogether pleasing to the Allies, who had proposed to establish an autonomous state for the benefit of the Ruthenes of Galicia and who were further alarmed at the extension of Polish rule over parts of Lithuania where the population was by no means dominantly Polish. Paderewski was inclined to compromise with the Allies on this question, and in doing so lost the enthusiastic support which had hitherto been vouchsafed to a man who had devoted a large part of his life to the advocacy of his country's claims to independence. The criticism and abuse which was now directed against Paderewski was too much for a man who, as a distinguished pianist, had been accustomed to applause rather than vituperation, and at the end of 1920 Paderewski resigned the premiership and abandoned politics in disgust. The Polish Government refused to accept the Allied suggestions regarding Ruthenia, but a "home rule" compromise was eventually arranged in 1922.

There followed a series of wrangles over disputed border territories, one of which had lasting consequences. The plebiscites arranged by the Versailles Treaty for the districts of Allenstein and Marienwerder showed such overwhelming majorities for Germany that there was little ground for protest, but the Silesian situation was more complicated. Here the plebiscite of 1921 resulted in a general majority for Germany, but the strong Polish minority of the eastern portion of the plebiscitary area refused to accept the situation, and the official representative of Poland in the district, Korfanty, headed an armed rising. A civil war between Germans and Poles was eventually stopped by the intervention of Allied troops. The whole matter was then reopened before the League of Nations, which awarded a strip of territory with a population of over three quarters of a million to Poland. This area received a grant of "home rule", with a separate local Diet of limited powers. Minor frontier problems that had led to

some fighting between Poles and Czechs in 1920 were settled amicably in 1924 by a slight rectification of the boundary.

The question of central Lithuania was more serious. The old Russian province of Vilna had been allotted by the Allies to the new Baltic state of Lithuania, largely on historical grounds, for—though in the province as a whole the White Russians were the largest group among the population, and in the capital the Poles were predominant—Vilna had been for some centuries the capital of the historic kingdom of Lithuania. When the great Bolshevik advance took place in the early summer of 1920, Lithuania opened negotiations for a separate peace with Russia, and the armistice which preceded this peace allowed the Bolshevik armies free passage through Vilna. Lithuania in this case was attempting to play off Russia against Poland, for the Poles had already talked of advancing claims to the city of Vilna and had suggested that Lithuania should come into a federal state of which Poland would be the predominant partner. On the defeat and retreat of the Bolsheviks Vilna was reoccupied by Lithuanian troops, who also advanced into the province of Suwalki, which the Curzon line had given to Poland. Poland appealed to the League of Nations, and a few weeks later the White Russian Legion of the Polish army, led by General Zeligowski, marched into Vilna and drove the Lithuanians out. Poland denied all official knowledge of Zeligowski's *coup*, but took no steps to discourage the Legionaries, and the League soon sent an international force to occupy the disputed area pending a settlement.

Both sides were willing that Suwalki should be Polish, and the disposal of the rest of the territory was referred to the Belgian Foreign Minister, Paul Hymans, as arbitrator. His award, announced in May 1921, provided for an autonomous state of Central Lithuania governed by a joint council of Poles and Lithuanians. Had either side to the dispute accepted this award, it would have been possible to take steps to enforce it under the Covenant of the League, but as both sides flatly rejected the compromise the plan fell to the ground. Meanwhile, with the approval of the League, elections for a local Diet were held, and when this assembly came together early in 1922 it showed a very large majority for union with Poland. Even those members who were opposed to union withdrew their opposition when they found their position in the assembly hopeless. The League then

withdrew its army of occupation, advising the two contestants to come to an amicable settlement between themselves. In April 1922 the Act of Reunion passed the local Diet, and the area was incorporated in Poland. Since further agreement seemed impossible, the Conference of Ambassadors—representing the former Allies—recognised the union, but ordered the formation of a demilitarised zone on each side of the frontier. Lithuania made an appeal to the League of Nations again in 1923, but after some discussion the matter was dropped.

Lithuania was not strong enough to challenge the annexation of central Lithuania by force of arms. Feeling, however, remained bitter against Poland, and Lithuania prohibited all trade with Poland until her ancient capital should be restored. The Polish-Lithuanian frontier remained closed to both trade and mails, and this ban has not yet been lifted.

Though Poland occupied so large a space on the map, the backwardness and poverty of so many of its provinces prevented its making any very remarkable progress in the years following the establishment of the Republic. The new liberty, too, was followed by that factious and quarrelsome bickering that has brought discredit on so many parliamentary democracies in lands that have received them as a sudden gift. The new Constitution came into force in 1922, and Pilsudski, considering his political work completed, retired from the presidency. He was succeeded by President Narutowicz, who was assassinated by a lunatic a few weeks after his election; Woiciechowski succeeded him. Under a succession of Premiers—Skulski, Grabski, Witos, Ponikowski, and others—Parliament degenerated into a nest of political intrigue, and sometimes into a bear-garden. The finances were in confusion, until the first Witos Ministry invited the British financial expert Hilton Young to come over and plan a sound system for Poland in 1923. To enforce the recommendations adopted from the Hilton Young report the Government was given dictatorial financial powers. Poland, however, avoided the widespread state of rebellion and violence which distracted the Balkan countries, in spite of the horrible *pogrom* in which some 250 Jews were murdered immediately after the proclamation of Polish independence.

It came, then, somewhat as a surprise when Marshal Pilsudski, returning to politics in 1926, led a body of troops to Warsaw and

seized the Government offices by force. The supporters of the second Witos Government resisted, and there was some desperate fighting in the streets, three hundred persons being killed. Pilsudski remained the victor, and Parliament restored him as President by a vote of 292 to 193. The Marshal, however, considered that as President he would be little more than a figure-head, and secured the election of his supporter Moscicki to the presidency, whilst he took the post of War Minister himself.

Since 1926 Poland has been governed by a dictatorship acting under the forms of parliamentary democracy. Pilsudski formed no new political party of Nazi or Fascist type, with special uniforms and distinctive salutes. Nor did he claim to be the apostle of any particular school of thought, though he professed a personal leaning towards moderate socialism. Parliament continued to meet, and though it became critical and even a little boisterous at times it submitted without serious difficulty to the autocratic demands of the Marshal, whilst there was no rebellion in the country. In fact, the same factors that had made the Bolshevik domination possible in Russia operated in Poland. The people had not enjoyed political liberty long enough to regard it as a normal condition of life. The masses obeyed the autocrat as promptly as they had obeyed the Russian Government, and far more readily, for he was a man of their own race. The actual practice was a rather strange mixture of dictatorship and parliamentary constitutionalism. In 1927 Parliament acquiesced in the power claimed by Pilsudski to govern by decree. In 1935 it approved, by a majority of nearly two-thirds, a new Constitution under which the powers of Parliament were restricted to matters of finance. Before the end of that year it had granted the Government emergency powers even over finance.

Pilsudski preferred to leave the premiership in the hands of one of his supporters. His nominees—Svitalski, Bartel, Colonel Slavek—proved at times somewhat inadequate to the task of handling the assembly, and in 1930 Pilsudski assumed the post of Prime Minister for a short time. There were times when the Marshal seemed to want to treat Parliament with the highest consideration; when the House protested at the preponderance of military men in the Cabinet in 1929 Pilsudski secured the resignation of "the Colonels" and appointed civilians in their places. In the same year Parliament objected to the bodyguard which escorted

the Marshal to the opening of the session. There was a real disturbance over this point, and Parliament was adjourned for a month to cool its feelings; when the Houses re-assembled, however, Pilsudski had dispensed with his bodyguard. At other times the Marshal used measures of coercion. When the demands of the Opposition for greater liberty of parliamentary action grew too loud in 1930, the Houses were prorogued, and on the malcontents availing themselves of a provision in the Constitution that a third of the members could secure a special session by petition, Pilsudski called the special session and then dissolved it before the members could even enter the Houses of Parliament. This year marked the most serious climax of parliamentary opposition, and eighteen members were placed under arrest. The ensuing general election, however, returned 249 Government supporters as against 125 Opposition members. When the Constitution of 1935 was passed, the Government failed to obtain the two-thirds majority necessary under the former Constitution, and secured its ends by the ingenious method of introducing the changes as amendments to the old Constitution, for which only an absolute majority was necessary. During one of the debates on these changes the Opposition walked out of the House in a body.

Outside Parliament there was some activity on the part of Communists and extreme left-wing Socialists, and in 1932 six of these agitators were sent to prison for illegal practices. Two years later concentration-camps were established for numerous Communist suspects; this measure was the reply to the murder of Pieracki, the Minister of the Interior, by an Ukrainian assassin. At the same time, however, the summary courts that had been set up in 1932 were abolished. Some students' agitation followed the placing of the universities under Government control in 1933, but the disturbances soon died down. In the same year there were some petty racial riots among the Ukrainians of eastern Galicia.

That Marshal Pilsudski established a more efficient and more honest system of government than had hitherto existed in Poland is undoubtedly. He usually balanced his budgets and sometimes ended the financial year with a surplus. Economic prosperity increased during the nine years of his rule. When the economic world-crisis of 1931 fell upon Poland he secured the grant of loans to farmers and restricted the interest on their mortgages. His

Local Government Act of 1933 replaced the Mayors of all towns with a population of over 25,000 by powerful Government officials, and the result was to check the appalling corruption which characterised Polish municipal administration and for which the town councils of Lodz, Tomaszow and Opalenitza had been dissolved. The dictator tried to cure the drunken habits of a section of the community by enforcing prohibition during week-ends, a restriction that was later reduced to Sunday mornings only.

In 1921 Poland signed a treaty of alliance with France. This was due not so much to gratitude for General Weygand's help during the Russian war as to the fact that both France and Poland were neighbours of a Germany from which each had taken territory. The cutting of Germany in two by the "Polish Corridor" in West Prussia had provoked a spirit of resentment among the Germans that foreshadowed a war of reconquest as soon as they were strong enough to attempt it. A further source of trouble in this direction was the relations between Poland and Danzig, a city which, though given an independent status by the Versailles Treaty, was German in spirit and in sympathy. There was trouble over the educational facilities given to the Polish minority in Danzig, over the right claimed by Poland to run its own post-offices in Danzig, and over the rivalry caused by the establishment of the Polish port of Gdynia, a few miles from Danzig. The postal question was referred to the Hague Court and settled in favour of Poland in 1925; for some years Poland imposed a ban on all export through Danzig in order to encourage the growth of her own port, but this ban was removed by a treaty arranged in 1933, in return for educational concessions and guarantees for the security of Polish Jews in Danzig. Ill-feeling between Poland and Germany developed a tariff war which lasted from 1925 to 1932; though a commercial treaty was signed in 1930, frontier incidents and anti-Polish speeches from Nazi leaders prevented ratification. Poland ratified the treaty in 1931; Germany consented to a provisional trade agreement in 1932, and in 1934 a more definite commercial treaty was signed, along with a pact of non-aggression which was to hold good for ten years. This *rapprochement* with Germany was made easier by the somewhat neglectful attitude adopted by France towards her eastern ally.

With Russia relations improved after the conclusion of the Treaty of Riga. Nationalist aggression as such was alien to Bolshevik ideals, and though there was some Communist activity in Poland directed by the Comintern, Russia became too absorbed in her own industrial development under the Five Year Plans to indulge in any attempts to regain the provinces lost at Riga. In 1933 a treaty of non-aggression was signed between Russia and Poland. With Lithuania relations remained bad; the seizure of Vilna was a grievance that could not be forgotten.

In May 1935, Marshal Pilsudski died. His place was taken by Colonel Rydz-Smigly—who shortly afterwards reversed the order of his names—formerly Inspector-General of the Forces. He began his period of control by a more moderate policy. A general election was held—at which less than half the electors took the trouble to vote—and a civilian for a time replaced Colonel Slavek as Premier. Smigly-Rydz, however, soon began to apply coercion to his opponents, and large numbers of arrests took place. In 1936 an amnesty was granted to 17,000 political prisoners—mainly because the jails were overcrowded—but there still remained some 30,000 prisoners and internees. Professor Moscicki, who had been re-elected in 1933, remained President of the Polish Republic: in 1936 Smigly-Rydz, now a general, was proclaimed “second citizen of Poland”. His severe attitude towards the parliamentary Agrarian party caused him to be very unpopular in the rural districts, and at one of the local festivals in 1936 he was presented with a petition from 150,000 peasants demanding the cancellation of the decree of exile against the Agrarian leaders. The government of Poland remained in a state of approximation to that of Germany before the war, a parliamentary democracy being controlled by a strong administrative group which drew its support mainly from a military caste. The Polish Parliament, however, had considerably less power and was treated with scantier ceremony than the old German Reichstag.

RUSSIA

When the Allied and Associated Powers were busy at Paris drawing up the new map of Europe and urging their respective claims for increases of territory, Russia was conspicuous by its absence. The Russian Empire had been one of the major com-

batants of the Great War; its efforts had been stupendous and its losses enormous, but the Versailles settlement was drawn up without reference to any representatives of the Russian peoples. There were two main reasons for this omission; Russia was at that time involved in a desperate and ferocious civil war, and nobody could calculate what Government would be in power when the treaty came to be signed; the forces that represented the old Empire, too, were so scattered and under so many different leaders that it was difficult to recognise at this stage any potential Government for Imperial Russia. The Government that was installed in the capital, too, was composed of men who held such strange ideas that their political language seemed well-nigh unintelligible to the diplomats assembled at Paris. These "Bolsheviks" appeared to have no concern for national frontiers and to regard all the basic political and social ideas of the other states as old-fashioned superstitions. To invite such people to Paris was regarded by many of the Allied representatives as tantamount to calling in a gang of lunatics and savages to the peace discussions. The nearest approach to negotiations with Russia was a suggestion that a separate conference should be held on an island off the Turkish coast where the representatives of all the warring groups of the Russian Empire could meet representatives of the Allies; the proposal was made dependent on a general armistice in Russia, and as this could not be arranged the conference at Prinkipo was never held.

After the collapse of the Tsar's rule, there had been three revolutions in Russia. The first, which was accomplished with very little bloodshed, got rid of the Tsarist regime and established a Government of Liberal tendencies. The second, which was bloodless, replaced the Liberal regime by a Socialist one, led by Kerensky. The third, which was followed by orgies of bloodshed, replaced the Socialist regime by one dominated by extreme Communism, the rule of the "Bolsheviks". Among the many revolutionary groups in pre-war Russia, the Social Democrats were one of the most extreme. At a conference of exiles belonging to this party, held in London in 1907, there was a split between the Majority—*Bolsheviki*—of the party, which wanted to treat the opponents of Communism as irreconcilable enemies and to exclude them from power in the coming revolutionary state, and the Minority—*Mensheviks*—which adopted a more tolerant atti-

tude towards divergencies in political theory. It was this Bolshevik wing of the Social Democratic party that, under the able leadership of Vladimir Ulianov and Leo Bronstein—who, like many persecuted Russian revolutionaries had adopted noms-de-plume for their propaganda, and were better known as Lenin and Trotsky—that seized power at Petrograd in the last months of 1917.

The general disintegration of the Russian armies that followed the various revolutions made it hopeless to continue the war against the Central Powers with any prospect of success. Early in 1918 the Bolshevik Government accepted the Peace of Brest-Litovsk, by which Russia gave up to Germany and Austria-Hungary vast areas in the west. Almost immediately afterwards the Conservative elements in Russia raised armies to oust the Communist Government and a great civil war developed. A small force of Allied troops was sent to Archangel to collaborate with the anti-Bolshevik forces, at first not so much out of antipathy towards Communism as to pin German troops to the eastern front. The triumph at Brest-Litovsk had enabled Germany to transfer masses of seasoned troops from Russia to France, but the prospect of a new Russian Government that knew not Brest-Litovsk, supported by an army of western Allies, would prevent this transfer of German army corps from being carried to extremes. Germany would have to leave some force in the east to watch the progress of the Archangel expedition. After the collapse of Germany the original *raison d'être* of this expedition no longer existed, but the Allied Governments decided to allow this army to continue its assistance to the Russian Tsarists who had welcomed its arrival, and thus put themselves in the position of wanton meddlers in the domestic politics of a foreign country. Public opinion in Britain and France proved wiser than the Governments, and after a period of agitation which was by no means confined to Communists and Socialists, the Archangel expeditionary force was withdrawn in 1919.

At the end of the year 1918 there were four main anti-Bolshevik armies in the field, approaching the Communist forces from north, south, east and west. The "Reds" had the advantage of a central position, holding the core of European Russia, including Petrograd, the old capital, and Moscow, to which the seat of government had recently been transferred. In the east, Admiral

Koltchak and Prince Lvov, operating from bases in Siberia, had advanced across the Urals as far as Perm; in the south, General Denikin, a hero of the Polish battles of the Great War, had secured control of the Caucasus regions, whilst a force of French and Greek troops from the Balkan front had landed at Odessa and Kherson to give him support. In the west the resistance to Moscow was directed by those Baltic peoples that were hoping to obtain independent status from the conference at Paris. In the north a Tsarist force was working with the Allied expeditionary force from its base at Archangel.

Throughout the year 1919 the civil war raged on all four fronts, being accompanied by the utmost savagery, wholesale massacres and extremes of brutality characterising the conduct of both sides. In the east, Koltchak never got as far as the Volga; after the capture of Ufa and Orenburg he was driven slowly back across the Urals into Siberia, where he fought a losing campaign, steadily retreating eastwards until he made his last desperate stand at Krasnoyarsk in January 1920. Meanwhile, a Socialist rising among the Siberians of Irkutsk had broken out in Koltchak's rear, and after the defeat at Krasnoyarsk the Admiral fell into the hands of these rebels, who handed him over to the Bolshevik forces; Koltchak was executed in February 1920.

In the south, the Allied forces were withdrawn in the spring of 1919, but General Denikin managed to make a successful advance without their aid, and, sweeping round into the Ukraine, his troops secured possession of Kharkov, Poltava and Kiev in succession, defeating a flanking column of Bolsheviks that swept round his left to Odessa in August. The Ukrainians, who had been given a state of their own under the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, shook off the German protectorate as soon as the Great War ended, General Petlura being proclaimed President of the Ukraine. Early in 1919 the Bolsheviks had sent a force to Kiev, and it was this army that was driven out by the united efforts of Denikin and Petlura in the late summer of 1919. Denikin's advance continued as far as Orel, and he seemed to be in a fair way to reaching Moscow, when Koltchak's collapse in the east released Bolshevik forces for the southern front. Denikin had quarrelled with Petlura, and the Ukrainians were now lukewarm in his support. In December 1919 the Bolshevik forces began a vigorous counter-offensive against Denikin, who was driven back with great

rapidity to the Black Sea coast towns and the Caucasian area. In January 1920 the Bolsheviks took Rostov and Mariopol on the Sea of Azov and stormed Tsaritsin on the lower Volga. In February Odessa fell, and in March Denikin abandoned the struggle, taking ship for England. An attempt to renew the civil war in the south was made by the Tsarist General Wrangel in the summer of 1920; he secured possession of Sebastopol and other Crimean towns, but was driven out before the close of the year.

The campaign in the north was never of very great significance, for the forces on both sides were small and supplies were scanty. The expeditionary force of some 20,000 British, French, Italians and Serbs quarrelled with the Russian contingents, which in turn quarrelled among themselves. In September the Allied troops were withdrawn, and the Bolsheviks reconquered the rebel areas at their leisure, entering Archangel in February 1920.

In the west, the Baltic peoples made little headway against the Russian Bolsheviks, who entered Vilna and Riga early in 1919 but failed to penetrate far into Estonia. A body of Russian "Whites" under General Yudenitch, basing their operations on Estonia, marched on Petrograd in the autumn of 1919, but were driven back after penetrating as far as Gatchina. Meanwhile, as a last effort of the British forces against Bolshevik Russia, a flotilla of motor-boats played havoc with the Russian Baltic fleet at Kronstadt and torpedoed two battleships. By the end of the year 1919 the Bolsheviks were in possession of most of Latvia and of eastern Lithuania; Estonia was holding against their attacks; Petlura was hovering on the borders of the Ukraine. Having disposed of all the other "White" armies, the "Reds" concentrated all their forces in the summer of 1920 for a conquest of the remainder of the old Russian Empire in the west. There followed the Polish war, which, beginning with a spectacular Russian advance in June and July, ended with an equally spectacular retreat in August, the Bolsheviks losing 100,000 men.¹ Petlura now invaded the Ukraine, whilst an independent state of White Russia was proclaimed by General Balahovitch in the area east of Poland. In October 1920 the Treaty of Riga ended the Polish war; the Bolsheviks abandoned the Baltic regions, but were left in control of the Ukraine and White Russia, from which the forces of Petlura and Balahovitch were soon expelled.

¹ See p. 159.

The “clearing up” of rebel forces of one kind or another took many months, particularly in Siberia, where there existed a welter of conflicting parties and armies. For long the “Social Revolutionaries”—a moderate Labour party—controlled the eastern portion of Siberia, and overthrew the Tsarist army of General Semenov at Vladivostok. Thirty thousand Japanese troops landed at Vladivostok to protect Japanese interests and to support the anti-Bolshevik forces. A few American and Canadian regiments also landed. In addition there were hosts of released prisoners of war who had never been repatriated since Brest-Litovsk, particularly Czechs and Poles, who organised “legions” of their own and usually took an anti-Bolshevik course. After Koltchak’s collapse, anti-Bolshevik republics were set up east of Lake Baikal at Verkhne-Udinsk, at Chita, and at Vladivostok—the “Far Eastern Republic”. Early in 1921 a Bolshevik expedition swept through Siberia and wiped out these little Governments, but later in the year, with help from the Japanese, the Far Eastern Republic was revived, and extended its control westwards as far as Chita. It was not till the autumn of 1922 that the Bolsheviks made their final conquest of eastern Siberia, when the Japanese troops were at last withdrawn. In the Transcaucasian regions separate republics had been established in Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia; of these the two last-named were of Bolshevik complexion, whilst Georgia was conquered by a Russian force and given a Bolshevik constitution in 1921. Rather feeble attempts to raise rebellions in the Ukraine were made by Petlura at the end of 1920 and again towards the close of 1921, but both were easily suppressed. No serious attempts were made to contest the independence of Finland or the possession of Bessarabia by the Kingdom of Rumania.

The organisation of Russia by the Bolshevik Government was undertaken by men who adhered more consistently to a body of political doctrine than perhaps any group of statesmen of modern times, not even excluding the leaders of the French Revolution. The devotion of the French revolutionaries to the “gospel according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau” was at best shadowy, and often mere lip-service: the principles enunciated two generations before by Karl Marx were kept constantly before the eyes of the Russian Bolsheviks. Few reformers have been in practice so thorough-going and so uncompromising. Thoroughly convinced of the

soundness and righteousness of their ideas, regarding the works of their apostle Marx as inspired with the highest human wisdom, they had lived through long years of persecution and disappointment fortified only by the conviction that their cause would inevitably triumph in the end. The ferocious savagery of the civil war confirmed and strengthened their ruthless determination to sweep away all traces, not only of the political system of the Tsars, but of the social and economic systems of the world in which they had been brought up, and that not only in Russia and its dependencies but throughout all the Continents. National boundaries were regarded as but temporary barriers to that revolution which Marx taught them to consider inevitable; the proletariat of the world was about to unite.

The Bolsheviks had begun by being democrats. But at the first democratic elections for a Russian parliament, though they secured a majority in Russia proper, they were in a minority in the complete assembly. They therefore dispersed the parliament by force, and devised a constitution of their own which, while maintaining the appearance of democratic election, secured the dominance of their own party. In the Constitution of 1918, which was amended on several occasions in the succeeding years, the central parliament was completely under the control of the Communists. This was achieved by three measures: the adoption of the open vote instead of the ballot, the system of indirect election, and the weighting of the urban electorate as against the rural voters. The franchise was the most extensive in the world; both sexes were eligible for the vote and for election at the age of eighteen, and there was no disqualification for aliens who resided in Russia. But just as Oliver Cromwell excluded Anglicans and Catholics from his electoral registers, so the Bolsheviks excluded all those who might be presumed to be enemies of a communist system of society. This ban was extended, not only to members of the Tsarist police-force and to priests but also to all those who employed labour for profit, all private traders, and all whose main income was not derived from their own active work. Though it was estimated that the disfranchised classes amounted to 10 per cent of the population over eighteen, numerous exemptions from the ban were granted, especially after the regime became established, and in 1935 the proportion of disfranchised was estimated at only 3 per cent.

The Russian Empire was divided into a host of very small units each returning a parish or town council; the rural parishes, being almost invariably entirely agricultural, held their elections at parish meetings, but the urban areas were divided into constituencies which were geographical only as regards those electors who could not be included in the occupational constituencies, which consisted of members of the same trade or profession. Thus in the towns most voters were registered in constituencies consisting entirely of steelworkers, boot-operatives, clerical workers, staffs of institutions, or other economic groups. The rural parishes were then grouped under what would in England have been called Rural District Councils; each District—the “Rayon”—contained on an average twenty-five parishes with an average total population of 45,000. Each parish council returned a few of its members to sit on the District Councils. The Town Councils and the District Councils were then called upon to select representatives to attend the meetings of Provincial Councils—corresponding roughly to the English County Councils; there were about a hundred of these “Oblasts” in the Empire. The Oblast system was modified by the existence of some large cities which were Oblasts in themselves and by the creation of local councils between the Rayon and the Oblast where special conditions of race or language called for an “autonomous area”—in such cases the Oblast was known as the “Krai”. The Russian Empire was next divided into areas corresponding to the major racial divisions, each of which was given the status of a Republic, though this name was also conferred on some of the “autonomous areas” which had marked racial divergencies from the surrounding districts. There were seven major Republics established in Soviet Russia—Russia proper, which included most of Siberia, the Ukraine, White Russia, Transcaucasia, and the three central Asian Republics of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tadzhikistan, the last-named being separated from Russia proper in 1929. The Transcausian Republic was subdivided into the three federated Republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. The Republican parliaments consisted of delegates from the councils of the oblasts and krais, including those of cities that were oblasts in themselves. Finally the seven great Republican parliaments sent delegates to a central parliament, called the All-Union Congress of Soviets..

Since all these elections were held under conditions of open

voting, the opportunities for coercion on the part of a strong and resolute Government were enormous—particularly in the higher stages, where the electors were limited in numbers, largely strangers to one another, and meeting at a distance from their homes. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Communist party became increasingly strong in the superior Soviets—"soviet" is simply the Russian word for a Council. The process of intensifying the Communist colour of the representatives was carried still further by the arrangements for the selection of the executive Government. The All-Union Congress was a huge assembly of about two thousand delegates who met for a few weeks every two years. This great assembly chose a more permanent parliament of two houses, 600 members becoming the "Union of Soviets" and another 150 forming the "Soviet of Nationalities", the former house being selected from the delegates of each Republic in proportion to population and the latter on a uniform system of five members for each Republic (counting the Transcaucasian area as three) and one for each "autonomous area". This two-house parliament, which held three or four sessions a year, was known by the name of the Central Executive Committee. Having thus reduced the governors of the people from 2000 to 750, the next process was to get the two houses in joint session to appoint a Cabinet—known as the "Council of People's Commissars", varying in numbers from a dozen to a score.

The weighting of the urban electorate was effected by giving the Town Councils twice as many seats on District Councils as they would have had on a population basis, and by increasing this disproportion to figures that varied between three and five to one in the case of the Oblast Soviets. There was no adoption of the initiative or the referendum, but the "recall", by which a constituency had the right of cancelling the election of a representative and electing another one at any time, was formally accepted for all the various Soviets. The Russians also adopted a device of the French Revolutionary assemblies in causing the election of substitutes who could take the place of the regular Councillors in the event of the latter being incapacitated by illness or absence. The elections for the executives of the Republican and local units were managed on similar lines to those which governed the selection of the Union Cabinet, and in every case the key-positions in government were, in the result, monopolised by members of

the Communist party, except in some of the tiny parish Councils. The full Councils of some of the larger towns were even larger than the All-Union Congress; the Moscow City Council numbered 2200, that of Petrograd—which was renamed Leningrad—reached the enormous total of 3000. The machinery of government included as many Departments, Advisory Councils, Commissions and Committees as were to be found in any modern state organisation.

The political constitution of Soviet Russia, novel as it seemed as a whole, derived most of its separate parts from experiments that had already been tried in other countries. The most remarkable work of the Bolsheviks, however, lay in the fields of economic and social development. The aim of these reformers was, not merely to give the people liberty under a constitution which gave everybody the vote, or even to improve the lot of the poor by equalising the distribution of wealth, but to create an entirely new type of society, in which every citizen was to play his part in building up such a standard of wealth and efficiency that all would share to the full the benefits obtainable by man's efforts and ingenuity in this best of all possible worlds. No Government in history has ever before undertaken such stupendous tasks or carried out its reforms on so gigantic a scale. That this was seriously possible was due to the presence of two factors that were more marked in Russia than in any other country. The first was the existence of a small but resolute and clever group of idealists—the Bolshevik party—fully convinced of the righteousness of their cause, supremely self-sacrificing, hard-working, and utterly ruthless towards all that they regarded as "sinister interests" working to oppose them. The other was the presence of a vast mass of subjects who had never known political, economic or social liberty, except for a brief illusory moment after the fall of the Tsardom; such a people was accustomed to accept the rules laid down for them by others, to respect the mighty power of an autocracy superior to the common man. The episode of the Russian peasant who, on the dethronement of the Tsar, took down the portrait of Nicholas II from the place of honour on his cottage wall and applied to the Government for a portrait of the Republic is something more than a humorous story; the idea underlying the peasant's action was of supreme importance in facilitating the constructive work of the Bolsheviks.

The Communist party in Russia had strong points of resemblance to Cromwell's Puritans who established their rule over the British Isles in the seventeenth century. This seeming paradox—for the Bolsheviks were the antithesis of the Ironsides in matters of religion—is explainable by the subjection of the individual will to an ideology which characterised them both. The ideology was not the same, but it demanded the same devotion on the part of its followers. Cromwell's political text-book was the Bible, as interpreted by the Puritan divines; the Bolshevik Bible was composed of the books of Karl Marx, which, being the work of a single writer, were more homogeneous in doctrine than the books of the Old and New Testaments. Such interpretation as they needed—and the changed conditions of the world since the days of Marx made some modification necessary—was supplied by Lenin, a brilliant scholar who spoke and wrote more languages than almost any other European statesman. The "Scriptures" of Bolshevism were still further expanded by Lenin's successor Stalin, a far less cultured person but who wrote with the voice of authority. Most revolutions have been annulled by the human weaknesses of reformers who have failed to live up to their high ideals; the little group of fanatics who worked out the principles of Bolshevism during their lean years of persecution and exile were acute enough to recognise this inherent weakness of all human endeavours to improve society and introduced an almost monastic severity of discipline and self-denial into the life of the "compleat Bolshevik". A strict adhesion to the "general line" of Communism, as laid down by Marx and Lenin—and afterwards by Stalin—was essential. Personal aggrandisement and the accumulation of wealth were to be eschewed; membership of the party was to be limited to those who showed continuous signs of what Cromwell would have called a "godly life". In the first days of triumph the party was naturally joined by many people who were merely turning their faces to the new sun. Such recruits were not welcomed by the leaders of the party, and periodical "purges" of unsatisfactory members have preserved the tradition of the founders of the movement. New candidates for admission to the party were placed on probation, whilst those whose conduct proved derogatory to the reputation of the party were expelled. Even those whose intellectual development was inadequate for the task of expounding the principles of Communism were

denied admission, being relegated to a special class of "sympathisers". The selective process of training the Communist party is an approach to Plato's ideal of a special class of governors, and in practice this limited aristocracy of intellect and character monopolises the important posts in the government of the country.

The policy of the Bolshevik party covered an enormous field. Much of its activity in the early years was directed to "liquidating" the opposition to the new regime and avenging the suppression of the proletariat in Tsarist days. The civil war was accompanied by wholesale massacres and by proscriptions of those classes that might be presumed to be hostile to an equalitarian regime. Not only the nobility and the clergy but also the middle-classes—the "bourgeoisie"—were treated as natural enemies of reform. Capitalist proprietors of factories and other business establishments were expropriated without compensation. Investments were confiscated. Landlords were declared incompatible with a Communist state, and the small holdings that had been seized and fenced off by the thousand during the early days of the revolution were taken from the ownership of the peasants who had seized them and registered as State property. This latter process involved a second great economic upheaval, for many peasants, while hostile to the old landlords, had strongly individualist aims and the "kulak"—the land-acquiring peasant—was soon being treated as a reactionary bourgeois and disfranchised, whilst his land was torn from him. Reaction against the old authoritarian principles also led to an intensification of the anti-religious movement and to a widespread abandonment of the ties of marriage and of family responsibility.

The destructive side of the Bolshevik activity, while doubtless giving great satisfaction to those who had suffered under the old régime, was considered by the leaders to be important only as clearing the ground for the great constructive work of socialism. All production and distribution of goods, all useful services, were to be the concern of the state and directed by the state. The profits of industry were to go to the whole people; the wages and the conditions of labour were to be dictated by the state on lines which would further the interests of the citizens. To nationalise Russian manufacturing industry, though in itself a huge task, was simple when compared with the task of nationalising agriculture, on which the bulk of the nation lived. Even in industry the direct

running of businesses by the state was found to present enormous difficulties, and from quite early days both producers' and consumers' co-operative societies were formed to conduct the businesses taken from the capitalists. Trade unions too were entrusted with a good deal of the business management, though in the last resort the political Government could intervene to dictate all the conditions of industry. The main point about this delegation of state control to trade unions and co-operative societies was that neither the profits nor the management of the industries remained in the hands of private enterprise. It was not until 1928 that communal farms began to appear on a large scale; these were at first run by Government Departments, but with the extension of the socialist policy over the agricultural population the co-operative idea became dominant, and the "collective farms" or *kolkhozi* soon far outnumbered the "state farms" or *sovkhosi*.

Along with the main policy of socialising production and distribution, the Soviet Government envisaged a host of beneficial social services. In this sphere the Bolsheviks merely adopted, often with considerable extensions, the schemes already in force in the more advanced western countries. Free health services, including the treatment of disease in all its forms, were to be established for the whole population. Education, which had made little progress in Tsarist Russia, was to become universal and open to all without fee. Insurance schemes for unemployment were started. Vast research institutions were to be founded to explore the possibilities of still further adding to the scientific knowledge which gave man so great a command over the amenities of his environment.

Finally, and perhaps more important than the schemes involved in the programmes of material progress, the Russian Communists aimed at effecting, by means of education and social "atmosphere", a revolution in human nature itself. It was no novelty to realise that many of the ills from which mankind suffers are due to the selfish individualism that prompts every man to seek gain for himself and to leave the Devil to look after the least successful grabbers. The Greek philosophers and the Christian Church, the followers of Confucius and the Hindu pandits had through the centuries preached fraternity and co-operation. Hitherto what the Christian Church called the "old

Adam" had been too strong for the development of an altruistic mentality in any country; the Bolsheviks believed that the establishment of their communal state and a sound system of education would succeed where other ethical movements had failed.

This gigantic programme of reform was necessarily confined to the peoples who inhabited the old Russian Empire, and even some of these peoples were beyond the effective reach of the Moscow Government. Yet the Bolsheviks never lost sight of Karl Marx' prophecy that Communism would inevitably sweep the whole world; they were prepared, as soon as the time was ripe, to embark on a world crusade as cheerfully and as ruthlessly as they had embarked on their revolution in Russia. Meanwhile the happy day could be brought nearer by ceaseless propaganda. National separatism was regarded as one of the worst enemies of human progress, and though the military and economic supremacy of Russia proper remained unshaken in the new Bolshevik state, the idea of "Russian" rule was studiously avoided from the start. "Cultural autonomy" received the approval of the Soviet leaders; national languages, literatures, traditions, "manners and customs" were to be encouraged as lending pleasant variety to life, so long as they were not anti-social in tendency. The grant of equal franchise to foreigners, irrespective of race or colour, as soon as they took up residence in Russia, was one sign of this attitude. Another sign was the name adopted for the new state: "The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" discarded all trace of national distinctions.

Such were the main ideals which impelled the Soviet leaders to undertake their remarkable work in the dominions of the old Russian Empire. For many years the idealist side of the Bolshevik movement was not recognised by the peoples of other countries. This was due partly to the memories of the Great War—for Tsarist Russia had fought and suffered for the Allied cause and Bolshevik Russia had surrendered to the Germans at Brest-Litovsk—and partly to the political opposition to Communism organised by the various Conservative parties through the medium of the Press. More effective causes of the almost universal distrust and dislike of Bolshevism outside the Russian dominions were the appalling brutalities of the civil war and the blatant attacks on ideas and institutions that commanded almost universal respect in most other countries, particularly as regards religion and the

institutions of marriage and the family. In the more advanced countries, too, the violent methods preached by the Russian revolutionaries excited antipathy and disgust rather than enthusiasm, for public opinion in the leading Christian countries had advanced at least far enough along the idealist road of Christianity to have developed a horror of killing as a method of settling domestic political and social problems. Even the slaughter of armies in foreign wars, which had often been tolerated as an unavoidable concomitant of bravery and glory, assumed a repulsive aspect among the peoples to whom the conscription of manhood in the recent war had brought such widespread loss and suffering. To many millions of people outside Soviet Russia the "Bolshies" are to this day believed to be uniformly brutal, cruel, and devoid of either religion or ethics.

The Communist Government, once it had got the civil war "liquidated", settled down to organise a country that had become a positive wilderness of decay. The Great War had left behind its own train of disorganisation and loss; the civil war was infinitely more destructive. Russian industry, never very extensive in comparison with that of the great nations of the west, was almost derelict; figures of production in many manufacturing industries stood at figures like 2 per cent and 5 per cent of those for 1913, the last pre-war year. In addition to the accumulated waste of the years 1914 to 1920, Russia experienced in 1921 the severest famine of modern times. Famines had been periodic in Russia before Bolshevik days, but the disorganisation and destruction of the civil war, added to the discouragement of private enterprise in agriculture provoked by communist propaganda, made this famine worse than its forerunners. The whole south-eastern quarter of European Russia was affected, and the death-roll rose to more than ten millions. In spite of the deep hostility to Bolshevik Russia, foreign nations provided large relief funds, which were administered by a Committee presided over by Dr Nansen, the famous explorer. It was characteristic of the ruthlessness of the Bolsheviks and of their absorption in political aims that the first Relief Committee was dissolved as suspect of anti-Communist propaganda, some of its members being imprisoned. There was much controversy regarding the share of responsibility for the famine that might be allotted to the Government; at the end of 1920 an agrarian law had laid down the

principle that all agricultural production in excess of the personal requirements of the cultivators must be handed over to the Government, and this undoubtedly discouraged many peasants from producing the quantities that had previously been normal.

The widespread distress of the famine brought about a modification of the communist programme of the Government. Strikes and food-riots were threatening to bring on a second civil war. Even the Baltic fleet broke out into mutiny. Whilst putting down the disorders with severity, the Government resolved to call in private enterprise to relieve the appalling economic distress. This was the much-debated New Economic Policy—the “N.E.P.”—which caused serious friction between the two most prominent leaders, Lenin and Trotsky. Against the sturdy opposition of the latter, Lenin secured the adoption by the Communist party of a programme which gave at least a temporary respite to capitalist enterprise. The agrarian law of 1920 was replaced by one which guaranteed the pre-existing ownership of land for nine years; the compulsory surrender of surplus produce was replaced by a tax in kind in proportion to the total produced; factories, hitherto run directly by the state, were to be leased out to co-operative societies and even to capitalists. Encouragement was given to foreign capitalists to establish enterprises in Russia, and trade agreements were negotiated with Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Austria and Norway. Small dealers were allowed to open independent shops instead of being relegated to the position of managers for the retail trade department of an all-embracing state. At the end of the year 1921 an attempt was made to stabilise the inflated Russian currency, which had fallen in value to such an extent that one of the new roubles would exchange for 10,000 of the old ones. Though famine conditions lasted in some areas right through the year 1922, and even spread in sections of the Ukraine, there was a slow improvement following the adoption of the New Economic Policy, though the results were far from spectacular. The consciousness that the concessions to private enterprise were at best temporary damped the enthusiasm of those whose co-operation was being sought.

The more moderate policy continued to the time of Lenin's death in January 1924. A treaty of friendship—signed at Rapallo—was successfully negotiated with Germany in 1922. A treaty with the Pope guaranteed freedom of worship for Roman Catholics.

In 1923, after a period of severe persecution during which many priests were executed, the Greek Church—the national Church of Russia—was allowed to carry on its religious services under the direction of a regulated Church Congress. Meanwhile the constitution was being amended in several respects, and the Soviet Union took its final form as a federation of autonomous Republics, each of which was given the nominal right of secession, at the close of 1922. The wilder experiments of local enthusiasts were suppressed; a reaction set in against the licentiousness that had marked the first establishment of "communist freedom". Slowly Russian industry began to increase its output, though the figures of production were still far below those of pre-war years. Meanwhile domestic opposition was held in check by a systematic terrorism directed by the Tcheka, the secret police, whilst a Red Army of three-quarters of a million, based on conscription, was placed on a permanent footing in the autumn of 1922.

The death of Lenin in 1924 was followed by the rapid development of schism among the Communist leaders. The dominant positions in the party were now taken by a triumvirate consisting of Stalin, Kamenev and Zinoviev. There was at first a marked reaction towards extremism, and in 1924 a fresh campaign against the residue of the much-harassed "bourgeoisie" began, the exclusion of middle-class children from secondary schools and higher colleges being strictly enforced. Trotsky worked hard to secure the abandonment of the New Economic Policy, but here he was unsuccessful, and in 1924 the Government confirmed its attitude of toleration towards private enterprise. The violent disputes on this question led to the dismissal of Trotsky from office and his temporary exile to the Caucasus region in 1925. It was noteworthy, however, that his return to Moscow was marked by an enthusiastic ovation from a section of the All-Union Congress, that was in session at the time.

A further cause of dissension in the party was the attitude taken towards the rural masses. Bolshevism had always been strongest in the towns, and the constitution had heavily weighted the urban vote; Stalin was distressed at this obvious distrust of the peasantry and suggested equality of treatment for town and country populations. Here Trotsky was supported in his opposition by the other two members of the "triumvirate", Zinoviev and Kamenev, who insisted on the dangers of increasing the influence of the

“backward” rural voters. Another cause of conflict was the encouragement given by Stalin to independent political thought within the limits of communist philosophy, the electors of the local soviets being encouraged to return to their Councils good men and women irrespective of membership of the Communist party organisation. It is said that the Tsar Alexander I, discussing his plans for giving Russia a parliamentary constitution in 1814, asked the Prince Regent of Great Britain to explain how a parliamentary Government was formed, and, having satisfied his curiosity on this point, went on to ask how a parliamentary Opposition was created. “Don’t worry over that,” replied the future George IV, “that will form itself.” The remarkable increase of non-party membership of the smaller Councils in 1926 under Government encouragement suggested that the Tsar Alexander’s query was based on a knowledge of Russian conditions.

The schism between the intransigent Trotskyists and the advocates of compromise led by Stalin widened after Trotsky’s return in 1925. In the following year, after a temporary reconciliation, he was again dismissed from office, and Kamenev went with him; a furious dissension broke out in the Communist party, and in 1927 the extremists, including Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev, were expelled from the party—and consequently from all hope of high office. The extremist leaders were extremely dejected after this defeat, and in a few weeks’ time they were asking for more lenient treatment and readmission to the party, which the majority refused them. In 1928 Trotsky was again exiled from the capital, being relegated to the Chinese frontier. Zinoviev and Kamenev, however, managed to patch up a precarious agreement with the dominant Stalin party. In 1929 the eight years’ conflict between Trotsky and his opponents culminated in the expulsion of the former from the Soviet Union; going first to Turkey, he found considerable difficulty in finding any other country whose Government would admit him. He later secured a residence in Norway, but his political activities directed to the resuscitation of his party in Russia led to his expulsion in 1936, and he then found an asylum in Mexico, after giving a promise to refrain from political activities. At the time of Trotsky’s exile from the Soviet Union a hundred and fifty of his supporters were placed under arrest and obtained release only by pledging them-

selves to submit readily to the policy ordained by the Government.

The Trotskyist left wing of the Communist party was not the only group that gave trouble to the Government, which was rapidly becoming a dictatorship of Joseph Stalin. A right wing of moderate communists was forming, headed by Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky; the leaders of this group were also called upon to pledge themselves to submission to the Government policy at the time of Trotsky's expulsion, and they submitted. The apparent unity established in the party by these measures lasted for three years, until the second expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev from the Communist party in 1932—for opposing the collective farm scheme—showed that the suppressed left wing had by no means reconciled itself to the dominance of the Stalinites.

Of more general opposition to the Government there was plenty. The foreign critics of Bolshevism were being continually supplied with material for propaganda by examples of severity towards these malcontents, for the death-penalty was liberally inflicted on those who were found guilty of "counter-revolutionary" activities. In some cases pronounced local agitation led to what were called "mass-executions", a dozen or a score of ringleaders being shot at one time. In 1929 forty plotters were executed in Caucasia. In 1930 forty-eight persons were shot after a trial by the tribunal of Ogpu, or secret police. In the same year the trial of eight University Professors attracted world-wide attention; five were sentenced to death, but in the event all went to prison. In 1933 more than a thousand political arrests were announced, and in 1934, after the assassination of Kirov, who was Stalin's closest adviser, terrorism was intensified. Sometimes foreigners would be involved in the political trials; notably in the Metro-Vickers case of 1933, when six British engineers in the employ of that firm were arrested, and in the Stickling case of 1936, when a German engineer of that name was the chief defendant. In these cases the British and German Governments brought severe diplomatic pressure to bear on Russia to secure the liberty of their subjects; two British employees of Metro-Vickers who had been sentenced to imprisonment were released after the British Government had placed an embargo on Russian trade, whilst Stickling was released—after a sentence of death—

as the result of a firm note from Hitler. The Russian subjects who had shared the sentences of these foreigners, however, received no relief from this intervention, and the six others condemned with Stickling were all shot.

The main instrument of terrorism in Russia was the organisation of the secret police, which bore a succession of different names. Under the Tsars it had been known as the Okhrana; reorganised with a Communist outlook by Djerjinsky after 1917 it received the name of the Tcheka; in 1922 it became the OGPU—these names being the Russian pronunciation of the initials of the official titles of the department. In 1934 it lost its distinctive name, becoming a branch of the Ministry of the Interior. Under whatsoever name it went, however, its methods and reputation were the same; it was empowered not only to arrest but to convict, and its activities produced a profound popular fear of the consequences of excessive opposition to the rulers of the country. It was even said that the severities perpetrated by the secret police were deliberately exaggerated by the Government itself as a means of securing submission from potential rebels.

The most serious problem from the Government's point of view was the revolutionising of rural life. Here a double task of enormous difficulty was to be attempted; on the material side Russian agriculture was to be stimulated by scientific organisation, mechanisation and rationalisation, and on the social side the peasant masses were to be educated alike out of their ignorance and out of their individualism. To some the task seemed so great as to be impossible; "you can never change the peasant", it was said, and after Lenin's death the Government was for a time inclined to concentrate its attention on the urban population and to let the peasants "stew in their own juice". The urban population, however, depended for its existence on rural production of foodstuffs; it was suggested that a limited agricultural area should be allotted to the production of these supplies under direct state management whilst the rest of rural Russia could be ignored and left to maintain itself as a great "reservation" for the lesser breeds without the law of Communism. Stalin's following, however, refused to accept this pessimistic outlook, and found a compromise between state management of agricultural production and individual ownership in the extension of the co-operative principle to the villages. State farms—the *sovkhosi*—appeared in

1928; the "collective farms"—the *kolkhozi*—run by producers' co-operative societies, did not appear on a large scale until two years later. By the end of the year 1930 fourteen million farms had become grouped in collective units. The collectivisation was not carried through without strong opposition, which sometimes took the form of wanton destruction of crops and herds. In 1932 the shortage of supplies was so great that famine conditions began to appear in the Ukraine; the number of cattle in Russia was said to have decreased by half in the course of little more than a year. The Government took action, on the one hand by deporting from their native villages many thousands of malcontents, and on the other by making concessions to the individualist spirit of the cultivators, their tax in kind being reduced and their liberty to sell in open market being increased. Food shortage remained acute for a couple of years, cereals and cereal products being strictly rationed in the towns until the beginning of 1935.

It took a whole decade from the establishment of Bolshevik Government in Russia for production to get back to the level at which it had stood in pre-war days. By the year 1928 a positive advance was anticipated. It was in this year that the Government initiated the first Five Year Plan. The whole of Russian industry was to be developed and co-ordinated under the direction of a central department; a definite programme of improvements and increased production was laid down for the ensuing five years. Each industry was given a separate programme to carry out, and constant consultation was held with the representatives of trade unions and local factories as the working of the plan proceeded. Each year the plan was revised to adjust its requirements to conditions brought about by factors that had developed during the preceding twelvemonth. The general aim of the Five Year Plan of 1928 was limited to the equipment of the Soviet Union with the machinery and transport facilities to enable consumers' goods to be produced in large quantities; it was intended to follow up this effort by a second Five Year Plan to increase the general production of the Union. Every effort was made to stir up enthusiasm for the great effort. Payment at piecework rates was almost everywhere substituted for time rates; prizes were offered for work of exceptional quantity or merit; the competitive team spirit was fostered by setting separate workshops or factories to beat one another's production figures; press and platform were

used to stir up the kind of universal effort that had hitherto been conspicuous only in wartime.

The production figures aimed at in 1928 were declared to have been attained within the five-year period. In 1933 the second Five Year Plan was initiated, devoted mainly to the production of consumers' goods, which were still lamentably scarce when compared with the supplies available in the western countries, though in excess of those produced in Tsarist days. There was, however, still a great deal of leeway to be made up in transport facilities in order to provide Russia with a modern system of communications; among the greatest works completed during the ensuing years the most famous were the White Sea and Baltic canal, constructed by convict labour and completed in 1933, saving several days' time in the journey from Leningrad to Archangel, and the Moscow underground railway, completed in 1935 and constructed largely by foreign engineers. Another great canal between the Volga and the Don was started in 1934. By the year 1936 the production of coal had been brought to a figure three times as great as any pre-war figure; and a similar increase was noted in the iron and steel trades and in the petroleum industry. A third Five Year Plan was prepared for application in 1938.

The spectacular development of Russian industry created great interest in foreign countries, and the Russian Government encouraged this interest, not only by general propaganda but by providing special facilities for tourist parties to inspect those areas and plants of which they were most proud. Compared with the state of affairs in Tsarist days, there has been a vast improvement in all material conditions. The huge tractor works, the electrical plants, the canals, the extensive housing estates are infinitely superior to anything that Russia has hitherto possessed. Education both elementary and advanced has made enormous progress, whilst scientific research and the extension of medical services are other marked features of the new Russia. The self-supporting character of the Russian dominions, with their great variety of products, and the effective control of economic activity by an all-powerful Government, have enabled the Soviet Union to avoid the great unemployment problem that has distracted the other great industrial countries. Russian fisheries have risen from a comparatively insignificant position to one among the most

extensive in the world; the opening of fresh mines has made Russia a gold-producing country of the first rank. Apart from the fact that for the supply of a population of some two hundred millions there is still room for vast expansion, foreign critics find much to decry in work achieved. The quality of workmanship has not generally attained the degree of excellence exacted in western countries, and all investigators comment on the inadequacy of housing development. That ordinary commodities—which in most cases strike the western visitor as appallingly expensive—will become sufficiently great in quantity and cheap in price to be as accessible to the masses as they are in western lands seems certain, if the rate of progress in manufacture continues as it has done in the last decade. The Government, which has always invited serious criticism from foreign observers, has taken steps to remedy some of the most conspicuous weaknesses of the industrial system. Since 1935 piecework rates in many industries have been modified to ensure a better quality of product; the housing shortage in the largest cities has been attacked by gigantic schemes of almost complete rebuilding that are projected for completion in the next ten years in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev. The self-sufficiency of the Soviet Union as regards products has enabled the Government to dispense to a large extent with foreign trade, but such exports and imports as there were passed under the strict control of the state.

After the passing of the first decade of Bolshevik rule, a distinct reaction against the intransigent attitude of the revolution was discernible. The expulsion of the Trotskyists was one sign of this. In a much-discussed manifesto to the people, entitled "Intoxicated by Success", Stalin, in 1930, warned his followers not to carry their enthusiasm to blind extremes. The reaction towards the ideas of the western peoples became still more marked after the rise of Hitler in Germany, which exercised a salutary effect on the isolationism of the Russian Government. The ineffective objurgations of the Powers of the Versailles settlement had driven the Russian leaders in upon themselves; they turned their backs on an unappreciative world and went on with the task of putting their own house in the kind of order that they considered good; leaving it to the Comintern—the world-propaganda department at Moscow—to make what progress it could with organising the small Communist groups in the capitalist

countries to work for the new ideal of humanity. After 1932 there was a great nation within easy striking distance of the Russian frontiers lashing itself into a state of furious hostility to Bolshevism and all its works. A militarist Germany had in the past enjoyed a reputation for thoroughness and ruthlessness which, revived under the Nazi regime, might prove sufficiently well-grounded to justify alarm in the new Russia. Faced by a war-weary world and a disarmed central Europe, the early Bolsheviks of the Russian Revolution had become secure in their self-sufficiency; besides, there was then a strong belief in Russia that the proletariat of the world was within measurable distance of uniting to enthron the principles of Karl Marx. The tendencies that had since shown themselves in other countries were mainly in the opposite direction, and it was quite conceivable that Germany, starting from a point of economic development well in advance of the Russian, might soon be heading a crusade to smash Bolshevism, a task in which she might calculate on having the active support of the Japanese and the sympathies of the Fascist and monarchist states. The reaction towards more normal social and political relationships within Russia was therefore augmented by the desire to obtain friends and allies in the western countries.

In no direction was the reaction more marked than in matters connected with the family. The years following the civil war had seen a truculent flouting of all the usual conventions of social and family life. Parental control of children was a form of despotism; children were little citizens who should be controlled by the state and not by the individuals who happened to have brought them into the world. Marriage was a form of bondage, a tyrannical restraint on the freedom of the citizen; it was reduced to the lightest of legal ties, and under the early legislation a divorce could be obtained by one of the parties to a marriage by sending a postcard to the local registrar. Sexual licentiousness was glorified as true freedom and was openly flaunted in the public eye. Western morality was profoundly shocked by the opening of Government clinics in all the cities of Russia for the purpose of supplying abortionists who would operate, free of charge, on both married and unmarried women. A violent "anti-God" campaign was conducted, in which—apart from the political persecution of priests suspected of plotting against the new Government—ridicule and insult were heaped on those who still

showed any reverence for religious worship. As a matter of fact, Lenin and his immediate associates had never approved of the more violent excesses of their followers, and with the growing-up of a generation that had no conventional restraints to flout, Stalin directed the self-expression of the rising generation into channels of self-control. The periodical purges of the Communist party became increasingly severe on those whose ideas of Communist freedom consisted of an infinite capacity for self-indulgence.

In a host of ways the reaction made itself apparent. A national campaign against the abuse of alcohol and drugs rivalled the temperance movements of the western countries. Within the Communist party the number of teetotallers and non-smokers became legion. In 1930 Stalin publicly condemned all insults to the religious feelings of the citizens, and ordained that no church should be closed unless a decisive majority of the local residents were in favour of such action. The schools taught, along with personal cleanliness, good morals, and the Russian press and stage, whilst allowing the frankest discussion of serious sexual problems, developed a Puritanism which contrasted strongly with the licensed ribaldry of some western countries. The enforcement of discipline in schools, which had been at one time weakened to the point of extinction in the reaction against all the old "tyrannies", was restored, and Russian schools became in their essentials little different from those of other countries. Divorce on the demand of one party was abolished in 1935 and in 1936 a "family code" was issued by the Government, directed towards strengthening home ties and encouraging healthy parenthood. The abortion shops that had so disgusted the foreign visitors to Russian towns were removed into inconspicuous alleys and back-streets, and the practice of abortion was itself prohibited by law in 1936. Even the old hatred of the Tsarist bourgeoisie was dying down; in 1935 the ban on the higher education of the children of these enemies of the new regime was lifted.

In the political sphere, too, there was a reaction in favour of the normal methods of democracy. A new Constitution was submitted to the Union Congress in 1936, and was passed into law. The most striking innovation was the abolition of the former devices for assuring Government control of the representation. Elections for all assemblies were to be direct and by secret ballot, whilst the urban and the rural electorates were now given the

same proportional weight in the allotment of constituencies. The system of Councils and Parliaments was roughly the same as had previously existed; but instead of a huge Congress which selected the members of a two-chamber parliament there were to be a House of 600 members returned by democratic election and a federal assembly of 240 appointed by the assemblies of the constituent Republics and the autonomous areas. Legislation required the consent of both Houses, but in case of a continued disagreement of the Houses there was to be a general election involving the dissolution of both chambers. Normally general elections were to be held every four years, and during the interim between Parliaments a Committee of thirty-seven members, appointed by the expiring Houses in joint-session, was to supervise the Cabinet. The "Council of People's Commissars"—the Cabinet—consisted of some two dozen Ministers appointed by the two Houses of Parliament in joint session. A somewhat lengthy list of "basic rights and obligations"—considerably more specific than the famous "Rights of Man" proclaimed by the French Revolutionaries—is included in the Constitution. Among the principles approved therein are the right to work, the right to fair pay, the equality of the sexes, the abolition of all national or racial distinctions among the citizens of the Union, freedom of conscience and of religious worship alongside of freedom for anti-religious propaganda, freedom of speech and of the Press, freedom of assembly and of association, the *habeas corpus* principle, the inviolability of homes and of correspondence, conscription, and the sanctity of public property. Among the specific benefits guaranteed in the Constitution are the seven-hour working-day, holidays with pay, free medical and health services, old age and sickness insurance, free and compulsory education, with facilities for free higher education, and special holidays on full pay for maternity cases. Though there is no specific prohibition of political parties, the specific permission granted for membership of the Communist party implies such prohibition, whilst the obligation of every citizen "to safeguard and consolidate public socialist property as the sacred inviolable foundation of the Soviet system", though leading up to a denunciation as "enemies of the people" only those who steal or destroy public property, may be interpreted as a ban on, at any rate, the non-socialist parties.

The development of the more moderate policies was accom-

panied by a recrudescence of the strife between the sections of the Communist party. Feeling became even more bitter than during the earlier disputes. Charges of conspiracy, treason, and even intrigue with foreign Powers, were bandied about wholesale. In 1935 the two defeated members of the triumvirate of 1924, Zinoviev and Kamenev, were sent to trial for treason against the state and condemned to death. So far the Bolshevik leaders had avoided the internecine butcheries of the French Revolution; this was due to deliberate policy, for Lenin, well aware of the tendency of men who rise by violence to use desperate measures to settle their quarrels among themselves, had extracted a pledge from the "old Bolsheviks" who engineered the revolution of 1917 never under any circumstances to send one another to the scaffold. Even after the sentence on Kamenev and Zinoviev in 1935, mercy was shown; on the special intercession of Lenin's widow the extreme penalty was remitted. It was, however, but a temporary respite. In the following year Stalin authorised a great "round-up" of Communist malcontents, and Russia was treated to the amazing spectacle of sixteen famous revolutionaries, including representatives of both right and left wings, on trial for their lives. Bukharin, the leader of the right wing, and Rykov, who for some years had held a position equivalent to that of President of the Soviet Union, were acquitted. Zinoviev, Kamenev and eleven others were sentenced to death and sent to execution. Tomsky, a member of the right wing, was announced to have committed suicide in prison. The pact of mutual forbearance between the Bolsheviks being thus broken, dog proceeded to eat dog. The year 1937 saw a further series of arrests of prominent Communists, and more executions. The trials presented several features which gave an air of unreality to the proceedings, and which provoked sceptical comments in other countries. The idea that these people had plotted the overthrow of the existing Government and the assassination of its leaders in order to place their own group in power was by no means incredible. But many of the accused were arraigned on charges of intriguing to restore capitalism and to undo the whole work of the revolution, and some of acting as agents for Germany and Japan. Most of the victims had committed themselves so deeply and for so many years to Communism that it was difficult to believe that such charges were true. Another

extraordinary feature of the trials was the complete and abject acceptance of the statements contained in the indictments by most of the prisoners. In the long series of political trials which marked the French Revolution hardly any of the thousands of accused admitted their guilt; these Russian "confessions" were too frequent and too comprehensive to seem real. Again, many of the prisoners were accused of engineering industrial accidents and local economic breakdowns with the idea of discrediting the existing Government; the alleged offences were often at best a clumsy, stupid and very ineffective method of bringing about a counter-revolution. The general effect of the trials and executions on world opinion was bad, not only because of the severity of the punishment but on account of the impression it gave that the Communist party was riddled with treachery and insincerity, and that the Russian Government was afraid even of those who appeared to be its best friends and supporters. At a time when the value of the Russian Government's alliance was being emphasised in negotiations with foreign Powers, this internecine strife within the ranks of the Communist leaders had a weakening effect.

The situation in Europe immediately after the war had given the Communists hopes of a widespread revolutionary movement. Communist states had been actually established in Hungary and in Bavaria, and a communist rising had taken place at Berlin. The central states of Europe were depressed and poor; the reaction from the trade boom of 1920 had created discontent in the western countries. The Bolshevik Government did all it could to stimulate revolutions in every country where there was an appreciable group of malcontents. In 1864 Karl Marx had secured the foundation of the first international Socialist working-men's association. Within ten years this "first international" had been wrecked by internal disputes between the supporters of armed revolution and the more peaceable members. The "second international" was then founded by the moderate Socialists as a rival to the first, which soon withered away. The Russian Communists revived the extremist organisation in the "Comintern"—the Communist International—with its headquarters at Moscow. Numerous foreign delegates attended the meetings of this "third international", but they represented a very small number of workers in the aggregate. The Comintern, though the Russian

Government was at pains to argue that it was an entirely independent affair, was in effect a branch of the Russian administration, and blew hot and cold according to the dominant policy at the Russian foreign office. Its propaganda was considerably hampered by its insistence on the complete submission of all foreign Communist groups to its own decrees and by its bitter attacks on the moderate Socialist parties in other countries, holding them up to execration as cowards and weaklings, if not as secret allies of the hated "bourgeoisie".

Such restraint as was exercised on the activities of the Comintern was at first dictated by a desire to obtain commercial products from the capitalist countries, particularly the machinery that was to start the new Russia on its industrial development. In 1927 a sharp lesson on the effects of revolutionary propaganda abroad was given by the action of the British Government, which severed all trade relations with Russia as a result of the discovery of propaganda emanating from the offices of "Arcos", the Russian commercial depot in London. The Labour Government of 1929 negotiated a reconciliation, but continued propaganda from the Comintern, which the Russian Government professed itself unable to control, strained relations with Great Britain almost to breaking-point. No actual suspension of trade occurred again, however, until the Metro-Vickers case, when an embargo on exports and imports was used to effect the release of the British prisoners. The rise of the Nazi regime in Germany, confronting Russia with the threat of invasion, acted as a more powerful brake on propaganda abroad, which had been carried on in most European countries, in the American republics, and in the Asiatic states, having its most successful effects in China, where large Communist armies were taking part in the interminable civil war.

Already in 1928 Russia had proposed, in a note conveyed to the League of Nations at Geneva, universal disarmament. The motives for this proposal were threefold: the Communists recognised in the regular armies of the capitalist states the most efficient engines for the crushing of revolutionary movements; with the initiation of the first Five Year Plan Russia wished to concentrate all her attention on the development of peaceful industry; advocacy of pacifism, which had a vast number of supporters in Europe, would be a recommendation for Communism in the eyes of a large section of public opinion abroad.

In the following year Russia followed up this general appeal by negotiating non-aggression pacts with her neighbours, Poland, the three Baltic republics and Rumania, and also with Persia. In 1932 Litvinov went to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva and took the lead in the movement for comprehensive abandonment of armaments. The non-aggression pacts were extended to include Finland and Czecho-Slovakia. In 1934 Russia applied for membership of the League of Nations, which she had hitherto regarded as a hypocritical body of cunning capitalists; the request was favourably received by most of the members, and before the end of the year Russia had joined the League and had been allotted a permanent seat on its Council. The swallowing of this reactionary pill was so bitter a task for many Bolsheviks that the announcement of Russia's going to Geneva was kept out of the Soviet press for some time. Meanwhile approaches were made to those states that had hitherto refrained from opening diplomatic relations with a Government that was perpetually trying to stir up revolutions of the proletariat, and official recognition was granted to the Soviet Government by the United States in 1933, though Holland and Switzerland maintained an obstinate aloofness.

By the year 1935 Russia was playing a normal part in the affairs of the European Powers. She had recognised the Versailles settlement, she was a member of the League of Nations, she had signed commercial treaties and peace pacts with numerous states. A new "national" patriotic spirit was being developed in Russia itself; public speeches began to ring with talk of the "Fatherland". The ancient diplomatic alignments—fear of the powerful next-door neighbour, alliance with the next-door neighbour but one—began to form themselves in despite of the unique social system of the Soviet Union. In 1935 a definite treaty of defensive alliance was signed with France; Czecho-Slovakia, which also feared Nazi aggression, coming in to the treaty as a third partner. The reply to this treaty was the military occupation of the Rhineland by German troops and the formation of a pact for the combating of Bolshevism between Germany and Japan.

With Japan relations had always been strained, particularly when the disintegration of China during the long civil war opened up opportunities for penetration by Japanese armies operating from Port Arthur and by Communist agents operating from Chita. Manchuria fell directly under Japanese influence; Mon-

golia became allied with Russia. The year 1927 marked the zenith of Russian Communist influence in China, the Cantonese armies setting up Soviets of the Russian pattern and adopting the hammer and sickle as their badge. But Communism, like every other "cause" in China, was completely overshadowed by the personal ambition of the military leaders and the plundering rapacity of the soldiery, and for most of its supporters had about as much significance as the red and white roses had for the gangs of retainers who fought the English civil wars of the fifteenth century.

Twenty years after the Bolshevik Revolution Russia displayed a strange mixture of ideas and policies. On the one hand were the studied glorification of Marxist Communism, the anti-God campaign, the hatred of capitalism, the ceaseless broadcasting of propaganda from the powerful wireless stations; on the other were the growth of minor capitalism in the development of the savings-banks and the flotation of internal loans, the toleration of the churches, the puritanism of Soviet morals, the new nationalism of the "Fatherland" campaign, the *rapprochement* with the League of Nations, the French alliance. Some observers saw in this mixture of factors the slow development of a monarchical form of state under the "dictatorship" of the powerful Stalin, whose portrait was displayed all over the Union as systematically as were the portraits of Mussolini in Italy and of Hitler in Germany. "Is Russia going Fascist?" asked an English newspaper in 1937. Others saw a slow and steady emergence of the old Adam of humanity from the temporary flood of artificial idealism engineered by a generation of revolutionaries that was fast passing away. Yet others saw only a cunning temporising with the forces of capitalism during the period of preparation for the final world-crusade: when Russia's economic reconstruction should be complete, then would come ruthless and devastating conquests of those nations that refused to bend the knee to the gospel of Karl Marx. Beneath the surface, too, were symptoms—difficult to estimate at their real value—of widespread internal dissension. At any rate, Russia had become a country widely different from anything it had been before.

THE BALTIC STATES

The Allies at Versailles had no hesitation in acceding to the demands of the Baltic peoples for independence of Russia. The result was the establishment along the eastern side of the Baltic Sea of four new European states—Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Though Finland was large on the map, it was composed largely of forests and lakes, and its population was little more than three millions. The other three republics were small both in population and in area, Estonia, the smallest, having only a million inhabitants. The four new republics adopted parliamentary constitutions of the English type. After the close of the Russian civil war, the three southern states were invaded by Bolshevik armies forming the right wing of the great advance into Poland, but the rout of the Russians by Pilsudski's armies in 1921 dissolved the Bolshevik menace, and the arrangements concluded at Versailles were confirmed by the Moscow Government. One great change, however, the war had brought about. Central Lithuania, including the historic capital of ancient Lithuania—Vilna—was seized by Poland, and it was noteworthy that the bitter quarrels of Lithuania and Poland over this province had driven the former state to adopt a friendly attitude towards Russia even before the Bolshevik forces marched to the suburbs of Warsaw.

From time to time the three small Baltic republics discussed the question of federation. In 1923 a customs union was completed between Latvia and Estonia. Lithuania, however, could not be reconciled to this movement on account of the Vilna question, for the other two republics had no quarrel with Poland and were inclined to treat the Poles as friends. However, in 1934 a "Baltic Pact" of the three states pledged them to observe a parallel foreign policy, though this appeared to make little or no difference to Lithuania's attitude towards Poland.

LITHUANIA

The politics of Lithuania were largely dominated by memories of Vilna. Poland was too strong to be attacked, but all trade across the frontier forced upon Lithuania by the Poles was prohibited, and even the mails were obliged to go by other routes. The seat of government was established "temporarily" at Kovno. Baulked of their ambitions in the south, the Lithuanians turned on the territory of Memel, for long part of Germany, but reserved by the Allies, along with Danzig, as an internationalised area, a High Commissioner for Memel being appointed by the Allied Powers. There was a large Lithuanian population in Memelland, and in 1923 a Lithuanian force marched into the territory. If the Powers and the League of Nations, it was argued, refused to expel the aggressive Poles from Vilna, then it would be unfair to expel the Lithuanians from this forcible acquisition. The League appeared to agree with this point of view, for in 1924 it sanctioned the transference of the territory to Lithuania, subject to the grant of local autonomy. In the following year the local diet was elected; it returned a majority of Germans. The local administration was thenceforwards strongly hostile to the Governor, who was appointed from Kovno, and in 1932 a crisis was provoked by the Governor's action in arbitrarily dismissing the "Directorate" or local Cabinet, arresting its leader, appointing a new Directorate of Lithuanian complexion, and dissolving the Diet. The Memellanders sent a petition to the Hague Court, which, examining the situation, declared that the reconstruction of the Directory was within the rights of the Governor but that the dissolution of the local Diet was not. The Governor meanwhile had resigned and fresh elections were held. The state of friction continued, and 1934 witnessed the arrest of 130 Germans in Memel, 90 of whom were sent to prison after a trial which produced a protest of the Memellanders to the Great Powers. The local elections of 1935 returned the same German majority as before—24 Germans to 5 Lithuanians. The Nazi Government of Germany naturally adopted the cause of the Memellanders as its own, but with a more liberal attitude on the part of Kovno a compromise was reached, and trade between Lithuania and Germany, which had been interrupted by the Nazi Government at Berlin, was resumed in 1936.

No better relations with Poland were established, constant incidents contributing to the maintenance of the feud. Polish Jews were exposed to persecution in Lithuania; the two nations imposed restrictions on educational facilities for the minority populations of each race, the special racial schools being closed down; Poland accused the Lithuanian Education Ministry of deliberately failing all Polish candidates for teachers' certificates. In 1927, at the request of the League of Nations, the "state of war" hitherto officially existing between the two countries was terminated by Lithuania, but the frontier barrier to trade remained rigid. Then there was an uproar concerning an official visit paid by the Estonian Premier to Vilna in 1930; the Kovno crowds demonstrated outside the Estonian Embassy, shouting that Vilna was a Lithuanian city. Even the devotion of the Lithuanians to the Pope as Roman Catholics was imperilled by this controversy; in 1925 a papal concordat with Poland placed Vilna under the Polish Church, and strong protests were addressed from Kovno to Rome. The Lithuanian Parliament had begun by being strongly clerical in sympathy, the "Christian Peasants" party having a definitely Catholic policy, but from now onwards there was constant friction with the Vatican, Catholic newspapers being suppressed and the Nuncio expelled in 1931. The Pope agreed to appoint a new Nuncio who would refrain from interfering in Lithuanian politics, and relations somewhat improved.

As far as internal politics were concerned, Lithuania experienced manifestations of both the Communist and the Fascist movements. In 1926 the "Iron Wolf"—a society of Fascist type—organised a military revolt in Kovno; the parliamentary Government was arrested and in a short time Valdemaras, leader of the rebellion, became virtual dictator. This successful insurrection was followed by the arrest of 250 Communists, a few of whom were executed. The following year there was a rebellion in the western districts, but it was suppressed. For three years the Lithuanian Parliament submitted to the rule of Valdemaras; then, in 1929, after a bomb had been thrown at him, Parliament became bold enough to vote him out of office. Valdemaras submitted; his "Iron Wolf" was dissolved and a few months later he was deported to a village some distance from the capital. His party, however continued to plot for his restoration, and on three occasions he was arrested and brought to trial for conspiracy and

for some of his actions whilst Premier. On the first two occasions he was acquitted, but on the third—in 1934—he was sent to prison for twelve years, along with three of his supporters. Two years later seven more were jailed for plotting his release.

But though Valdemaras had gone, his autocratic methods remained behind. In 1935 the Government, following the example of Russia, Germany and Italy, suppressed all the political parties and carried through a new Constitution, the new Parliament consisting of delegates selected by local councils on their alleged personal merits. This Constitution was proclaimed in 1936.

LATVIA

Latvia, which had been sorely harassed in the first few years of its existence, the Russian armies invading it and even a German corps—under General von der Goltz, who had come to protect the German residents—carrying war through the country, settled down after 1920 to peaceful reconstruction. Extremist politics were represented by Communists and by a Fascist group, but the activities of these parties did not become very important until the advent of the great economic crisis of 1931 gave opportunities for agitation. In 1930 some thirty Communists were sent to prison and in 1933 the Communist members of Parliament were arrested, along with the leaders of the *Perkonkrust*, the Fascist organisation.

In 1934 a *coup d'état* was carried out by the Premier, Ulmanis. Parliament was dissolved, the Socialist leaders were arrested, the municipal councils were reconstructed and martial law proclaimed. A Constitution of Fascist Corporative type was drawn up, with a Parliament representing industrial organisations. With Ulmanis as dictator, Latvia remained under martial law until 1937.

ESTONIA

Estonia was troubled with more serious Communist disturbances than had distracted Latvia. There was a Communist rising at Reval in 1924; outrages took place all over the country; a Cabinet Minister was murdered, and 150 Communists were put on trial, most of them being sent to prison. The parliamentary Labour party became definitely Communist, and was dissolved in 1930. A new Constitution, substituting a two-chamber Parlia-

ment for the former single House, was passed in 1934, but there was so much disturbance in the country that the first of the new elections had to be postponed, whilst numerous agitators, both Communist and Fascist, were arrested. The Estonian Fascist group—who called themselves the “Liberators”—was dissolved in 1934 and the Fascist candidate for the presidency, General Laska, was forced to withdraw. Like Latvia, Estonia was placed under martial law, which lasted from 1933 to 1937, but the Government was more democratic in tone than that of Latvia, and in 1936 about 150 “Liberators” were sent to prison.

FINLAND

Since the conquest of Finland by the Swedes in the Middle Ages, its people had never enjoyed complete independence until towards the end of the Great War. Transferred from the Swedish crown to that of Russia as the result of a war in 1809, Finland—or Suomi as the Finns call it—retained its local Diet and laws, but had to accept the Tsar as Grand Duke just as in earlier days it had accepted the Kings of Sweden as the natural holders of that dignity. Unlike Poland, Finland had not been subjected to a consistent policy of Russification, and it was not until the end of the nineteenth century that the Russian Government attempted any serious interference with local liberties. Then trouble arose over the attempt of the Tsar Nicholas II to enforce conscription for his army on the Finnish people, or in default of military service a special tax for military expenditure. In 1912 the Diet was dissolved, a nominated Russian Senate taking its place, and so great was the discontent in Finland that many of its natives enlisted in the German army in 1914 to fight against their Russian oppressors.

The Russian revolution of 1917 enabled the Finns to assert their local liberties once more, but it was not until after the forcible seizure of power by the Bolsheviks that they went as far as to proclaim complete separation from Russia. The decision of the Diet to break off the Russian connection completely, at the end of 1917, provoked a rising of Finnish Bolsheviks, supported from Russia, and in the spring of 1918 a violent civil war developed, in which the “Reds” at first carried all before them. The anti-Bolshevik Government appealed for aid to Sweden,

which, having kept out of the Great War, was unwilling to become embroiled in a Baltic conflict. Appeal was then made to Germany, with which, according to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty which put Russia out of the Great War, Finland was nominally allied. A force of 12,000 German troops was sent to Finland, and with their aid the "Whites" overcame the Bolsheviks, though not until after a desperate struggle. While the German troops under von der Goltz defeated the "Reds" at Karis and Lahti, the local "Whites" gained victories at Tammerfors and Viborg. A Red Terror was followed by a White Terror of equal ferocity, and in the course of the conflict some 15,000 Finns were slaughtered. The "White" leaders, Svinhufvud and General Mannerheim, now organised a militia to maintain order and, in return for the German assistance, the crown of Finland was offered to the Kaiser's brother-in-law, Prince Charles of Hesse, who accepted it.

The collapse of Germany in November 1918 altered the situation. The Finns entered into friendly relations with the victorious Allies, and nothing more was heard of the projected coronation of Charles of Hesse. In 1919 a Republic was proclaimed, and a Constitution was drawn up. Desultory fighting with the Russian Bolsheviks continued until 1920, when peace was signed at Dorpat, and in 1921, after a dispute with Sweden over the Aland Islands, where the inhabitants wanted union with the Swedes, the League of Nations negotiated a compromise under which the islanders received local autonomy within the Finnish Republic.

The Finnish Diet had been elected by universal suffrage since 1905—at such times as it was allowed to function—and it had passed many progressive laws of social reform only to have them vetoed by the Tsar as Grand Duke. Finnish politics were conducted by a number of groups, of whom after the Great War the Socialists were the most numerous. The sympathy shown to the Bolsheviks by many Socialists at the time of the civil war of 1918 led to the proscription of the party after the "White" victory, but the more moderate section held together and was allowed to contest the general election held in 1919, returning 80 members out of a total House of 200, the Agrarians being the next largest single party, with 42 seats. In 1921 a general amnesty for political offenders was proclaimed, but numerous exceptions were made, and it was not until 1927 that the last rebels of the civil war were

released and restored to full civic rights: this final amnesty was carried in the Diet by a majority of only two votes.

Anti-Socialist Coalition Governments under a succession of premiers held office from 1919 to 1926, with two brief intervals of "non-political Cabinets" containing civil servants, who took office during party disputes in 1922 and 1924. Much progressive legislation was carried through during these seven years, the most discussed measures being the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic drinks in 1919 and "Kallio's Act" of 1923, for the compulsory purchase of large estates to resell to small holders: this Act took its name from the Prime Minister of that time. The Socialist party was meanwhile gathering strength, especially since its complete dissociation from the Bolsheviks, who supported a new Finnish Communist party which won 27 seats in the Diet of 1922. In the following year the Government suppressed this party, confiscating its newspapers and arresting nearly all its representatives in Parliament. Notwithstanding this coercion, the Communists returned 18 members at the general election of 1924. The upheaval caused by a "graft" scandal connected with a Government contract with a munition factory in 1925 brought about the fall of the second Kallio Ministry, and in default of agreement between the anti-Socialist groups a Socialist Ministry took office under Tanner. After the elections of 1927, however, in which the Socialists failed to increase their poll, an anti-Socialist Government was again installed in office.

For the second time the Finnish Communist party found itself suppressed in 1930. Its revival had not been seriously checked by the various Governments, and it was a semi-Fascist organisation that procured the second proscription. The Lapua Society, named after the village in which it was first formed, conducted a violent agitation against Communism, and there were soon violent demonstrations, fights and outrages. Under pressure from the Lapuans, the Diet passed a decree suppressing the party in 1930, 134 votes out of the 200 being recorded in favour of the proposal. More than fifty Communist leaders were arrested and consigned to jail. In the following year numerous small Trade Unions which professed Communist principles were also suppressed. The success of the Lapuans in obtaining the suppression of their enemies encouraged them to continue their interference in politics. Accusing the Minister of the Interior of weakness

towards revolutionaries, they assembled an armed force in 1932 at Mantsala, forty miles north of the capital, and marched on Helsingfors to procure his dismissal. Realising that the situation was drifting towards a Fascist dictatorship, the Government called out troops to oppose the Lapuans, who quickly abandoned their truculent attitude and handed over their weapons. A hundred of the Lapuans were sent for trial and fifty were sentenced, but only a score actually went to jail. At the same time numerous Communists were arrested, and during the year 1932 more than thirty were committed to prison. To prevent any repetition of the Lapuan adventure, an Act to prohibit political uniforms was passed in 1933, and the proscription of Communists continued with unabated vigour.

The former leaders of the Lapuans were now organising a new movement on German Nazi lines, known as the "People's Patriotic Movement"; several of its members were arrested for disturbances, and some for libelling the Government of the friendly neighbour-state of Estonia. A Bill enabling the President to suspend the Constitution in the event of a political crisis was rejected by Parliament in 1936 on the eve of a general election. At this election the People's Patriotic Movement obtained 14 seats; the Socialists secured 84 and the Agrarians 53. Kallio took office for the third time and immediately secured the passing of an Act to suppress the activities of the Patriotic Popular Movement.

The law prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors provoked continuous criticism and agitation from the time of its passage into law in 1919. In 1928 it was still further strengthened. It was becoming generally recognised, however, that prohibition was leading to similar evils as had characterised the system in America; there was much smuggling of illicit liquor, whilst a marked increase in hooliganism was attributed to the drinking of beverages of the "moonshine" type. In 1931 Parliament sanctioned a referendum on the question, and by a vote of over half a million to less than a quarter of a million prohibition was brought to an end. The sale of alcoholic liquors was restored, but as a state monopoly. A grim commentary on the situation was provided by the release from prison, at the repeal of the Prohibition Act, of 20,000 offenders against its provisions.

Another long-standing topic of controversy was the language

question. A large minority of the people in the southern districts—including many of Finnish race—habitually spoke Swedish, and in 1919 Finnish and Swedish had been placed on a footing of equality for official purposes. In 1933 the “all-Finnish” agitators proposed legislation which not only would have abolished the bi-lingual examination for municipal officials but would have excluded Swedish from the debates of the Diet. The bill, however, after provoking violent opposition, failed to secure a majority.

Labour and social legislation of an advanced type has been adopted in Finland since the establishment of the Republic. The prohibition of child-labour, the eight-hour day, and the principle of holidays on full pay for all regular employees have been accepted, whilst in few countries has the co-operative system developed to so comprehensive a degree as in Finland. Education has been made free from the elementary school to the universities. Municipal enterprise in the larger towns has been marked, and the system of communications by rail, road and steamer—along the numerous lakes and canals—has been brought to a high standard. Incidentally Finland is the only state that has refused to default in its payment of debts to the United States. Apart from an attempt to interest the League of Nations in her claims to the Russian province of Karelia in 1923, Finland has shown little interest in foreign political relationships. A treaty of alliance negotiated with Estonia, Latvia and Poland in 1922 was refused ratification by Parliament. Finland, however, joined the Oslo economic pact in 1932.

DENMARK

Though Denmark had not been one of the Allies, she received an increase of territory at the expense of Germany. Plebiscites were held, under the Treaty of Versailles, in the two zones of Schleswig; though the southern zone gave a four to one majority for Germany, Denmark was awarded the northern zone by a three to one majority, and the district was incorporated in the kingdom. The treatment of the minorities on both sides of the new frontier was exceptionally good, and little ill-feeling arose over the change.

In 1920 there was a movement for the establishment of a republic in Denmark. King Christian X had dismissed Zahle, the Radical Prime Minister, who held office with the support of

the Socialist party. The Socialists and Radicals held that this action was unconstitutional, and urged that the time had come for the abolition of the monarchy; at the ensuing general election, however, a coalition of Liberals and Conservatives obtained a majority, and the two republican parties were relegated to the opposition side of the house. Later in the year this situation was confirmed by a second election, made necessary by the reconstruction of constituencies after the union with northern Schleswig. The agitation against the monarchy soon died down, and when the Socialist-Radical coalition won the election of 1924, the new Government took no steps towards republicanism. Later alternations of party Government were carried out without undue rancour.

Social legislation of a modern type occupied much of the attention of the Danish Parliament. In 1921 a national health insurance Act was passed; the income-tax was introduced, and a mild capital levy was made. In 1934 arbitration in industrial disputes, which had for long been optional, was made compulsory, whilst two years later the decisions of the official referee were made binding on all parties. Military defence and prohibition were also topics of much discussion. The Socialists were at one time in favour of complete disarmament, but although considerable reductions of the forces were made in 1925, the army was not abolished. A measure of prohibition had been adopted in Denmark, but as the result of a plebiscite in 1933 this legislation was reversed.

The great slump of 1931 hit Denmark very hard, particularly when it was followed by the tightening of protective tariffs and the abandonment of Free Trade by Great Britain—Denmark's best customer. A series of quota agreements, however, restored a good deal of the trade, though at one time, in 1932, 40 per cent of Danish workers were unemployed.

ICELAND

Iceland had been recognised as a sovereign state by an agreement negotiated in 1918, which was to hold good for twenty-two years. The "home rule" spirit in the island at first continued to regard the connection with Denmark as objectionable and to look forward to 1940 as the year of ultimate separation from the

Danish connection, but as years went on a more friendly feeling supervened, and after the abolition of the post of Minister for Iceland in the Danish Government in 1920, the reign of King Christian was more readily accepted by the Icelanders.

NORWAY

Norway, like Denmark, was awarded an increase of territory by the Allies, who recognised the Norwegian claims to the Spitzbergen islands, which were also claimed by Russia. The formal annexation was not carried out until 1925. Norwegian fishing interests off the Greenland coast led to a desire to assert political control over this dreary region of the earth, and in 1931 the Norwegian Government formally annexed the eastern coast between Scoresby Sound and Shannon Island. Next year a Norwegian party landed farther south, near Cape Farewell, with the view of annexing a further stretch of coast. Denmark, whose control over Greenland had hitherto passed unchallenged, suggested an appeal to the Hague Court, and Norway accepted. The Court did not give its award until 1933, when the Danish claims were accepted; in spite of the fact that some ill-feeling had developed during the dispute, Norway accepted its defeat with a good grace, and no unpleasant results ensued.

The Norwegian Labour party was slow in developing, but by 1928 it was sufficiently strong to take office for a brief period. During the previous decade it had been distracted by internal strife, its left wing leaning towards Moscow. There were numerous strikes in 1920 and 1921 culminating in the proclamation of a general strike following a cut in the wages of seamen. Volunteers were called for to run essential services, and conditions in Norway resembled those in Great Britain in 1926; some of the Trade Unions, however, declined to participate in the general strike, and after twelve days it collapsed. The Norwegian Trade Unions lost much credit over this affair, and in the following year membership had declined by a third. The most active section of the Labour party went definitely over to Communism, and at the general election of 1921 twenty-eight Communists were returned to a Parliament of 150. The general strike was followed by the passage of a compulsory arbitration Act in 1922—this was a temporary measure, but was renewed from time to time. The

development of a quarrel with the Moscow Comintern soon split the Norwegian Communist party, and at the elections of 1924 the Communists collapsed. The Labour party was reorganised on non-Communist lines in 1927, and at the elections of that year Labour obtained 62 seats out of the 150.

Though the Labour party took office for a few days during a Cabinet crisis in 1928, it was not strong enough to form a real Government until 1935. Though accused by its opponents of being still secretly in league with Moscow, it was at pains to show a moderate attitude towards social questions and in 1934 the Labour party dropped its hitherto consistent boycott of court ceremonies. It was noteworthy that in this year the Labour leader in Parliament, John Nygaardsvold, was chosen chairman of the House, and in 1935 he became Prime Minister in a Cabinet supported by Labour and the Farmers' party. This Labour Government passed Acts regulating hours of work and introducing old age pensions, and at the elections of 1936 the Labour party obtained 70 seats out of the 150, the Farmers returning 18 members, whilst the Conservatives and Liberals returned 36 and 23 respectively.

Prohibition, introduced during the war in regard to wines and spirits, became a measure of keen controversy after it. A plebiscite in 1919 gave a majority in favour of its continuance, the prohibitionists being particularly strong in the urban areas. The matter assumed a wider aspect when Spain, which was a good customer for Norwegian fish, threatened to impose an embargo on this trade unless the pre-war purchase of Spanish wines were restored. After long negotiations, Norway in 1922 agreed to import half a million litres of Spanish wine "for medicinal use". A similar treaty with Portugal was rejected by Parliament in the following year. After several years of controversy a referendum in 1926 brought the period of prohibition to an end, local option being substituted for it by an Act passed in 1927.

Norway developed a small Fascist party in 1933. Major Quisling, the Minister of Defence, had severely criticised Soviet Russia in a book he had just published, and an attempt was made to assassinate him; he forthwith declared that Communism must be fought by other means than democracy, and his National Socialist party was founded. It made very little headway, however, and at the 1936 general election it polled only 26,000 votes

and returned no members; at the same election the Communist poll shrank to 4000.

Many of Norway's political problems were linguistic. There are two forms of the Norwegian language; the *Riksmaal* is allied to Danish, and is the more literary of the two, whilst the *Landsmaal* is of more local development. The Radical party for long wished to make the popular *Landsmaal* the only recognised Norwegian language. The nomenclature of towns also gave rise to controversy. The proposal to substitute the ancient name for Christiania met with comparatively little opposition, and the capital became Oslo in 1924. The official adoption by statute of the name of Nidaros for the town of Trondhjem in 1929, however, gave rise to a storm of protest; a local poll showed a vast majority against the change, and it was declared that the old name was good Norwegian. Next year the statute was repealed by a majority of one, but for the repeal a two-thirds majority in Parliament was necessary and the agitation continued. In 1931 a compromise was reached, and the town became Trondheim.

Other topics of controversy were the continuance of the Government grain monopoly, which had been established during the war; in 1928, after a brief suspension, it returned in the form of control of imports, exports and prices; the proposed imposition of a tax on retail sales, dropped after a fierce opposition in 1933; the gold standard, adopted in 1928 and dropped again in 1931; and the concessions granted to the Unilever Trust, which caused the fall of the Mowinckel Government in 1931.

SWEDEN

Sweden has been remarkable as the most Socialist of the Scandinavian countries. Here the Labour party has alternated with the anti-Socialist parties—Liberals, Conservatives and Agrarians—to form Cabinets. The veteran Socialist leader Branting held office for a few weeks in 1920, but was defeated in the ensuing general election; at another general election in the following year he increased his following in parliament from 77 to 93, but as the opposition parties totalled 137 he was still in a minority, though as the leader of the largest party he took office. Branting remained Premier from 1921 until his death in 1925. His successor, the Socialist Sandler, was defeated next year, being replaced by

a Liberal Prime Minister. The anti-Socialist parties were, however, so divided, even within their own separate organisations, that majority government was impossible. Ekman's Ministry of 1930, selected from one section of the Liberal party, commanded only 28 votes in a house of 230. This Government in spite of its weak position managed to hold out until the acceptance of a subscription to the party funds from the notorious swindler Kreuger—of the Swedish Match Company—was dished up against it in 1932 and drove it from office. A general election failed to give any party a majority, and the Socialists returned under the premiership of Hansson. When this Government's bill for increased old age pensions was rejected in 1936, Pehrsson, the Agrarian leader, took office, but a general election shortly after returned the Socialists again as the largest party—yet with only 112 seats—and Hansson returned to the premiership, admitting several Agrarians to his Cabinet.

It was a Liberal Government that passed the Eight-Hour Day Act in 1919 after it had been rejected by the Upper House and supported by the electorate at the election of 1919, and the Liberals also gave the vote to women in the same year. Considerable modifications were, however, introduced into the Eight Hours Act in 1921. Sandler's Socialist Government reduced the army and instituted an inquiry into the activities of trusts in 1925. The first Hansson Government introduced unemployment insurance in 1934; hitherto unemployment had been dealt with under the poor law, and there had been a great upheaval in 1923 when the Government of the day prohibited the grant of relief to trade union members on strike. In 1935 Sweden tackled the much-discussed question of private manufacture of armaments by initiating a compulsory system of Government licences for this industry. Sweden also adopted the policy pursued by many of the democratic states in prohibiting the wearing of political uniforms in 1933. The gold standard was maintained until 1931. Prohibition was not introduced into this part of Scandinavia, but a tentative referendum held in 1922 showed a small majority against it, though it was noted that the women's vote was in favour of prohibition.

The Scandinavian delegates to the League of Nations were conspicuous in the cause of peace and disarmament. In 1926 the three Scandinavian states signed a treaty for the compulsory sub-

mission to arbitration of all disputes, and in 1930, following up the policy of the Geneva Convention for the reduction of tariff barriers, the Oslo Convention effected a wholesale lowering of duties as between the five signatory states, which included the three Scandinavian countries and the kingdoms of Belgium and Holland, the initiative of this move having come from Holland. It was estimated that a tenth of the world's trade was affected by this Convention, which came into force in 1932, Finland also joining in the group. A further gesture of goodwill towards men was the munificent action of King Gustavus of Sweden in 1928, in handing over five million crowns—about £200,000—that had been collected among his subjects for his seventieth birthday present to endow a great institute for research into the possibilities of curing cancer.

CHAPTER IV

Asia and Africa

TURKEY

Even less compunction was felt over the dismemberment of Turkey than in the Allied dealings with the other enemy Powers. The Turk had been “unspeakable” to a large section of Christian opinion for many years, and the “sick man of Europe” had for long offered to his doctors the opportunity of amputating his limbs. In 1919 it was even suggested that Turkey should disappear as an independent state, and that, after the liberation of outlying territories, the central core of the Ottoman dominions should be entrusted as a mandated territory to the United States. Had America been willing to shoulder responsibilities in the Old World it is probable that this arrangement would have been carried out. As it was, the Allies contented themselves with severing Armenia and Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria, the projections of the Turkish Empire along the Arabian coasts, the parts of Thrace west of the Constantinople peninsula, and a block of territory round Smyrna. The residue, consisting of Asia Minor—minus the Cilician coast and the Smyrna district—and the few square miles round Constantinople, was left as an independent state. An international Commission was to control the waterways leading from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, under the supervision of the League of Nations. The truncated Turkish state was restricted to an army of 50,000 and was forbidden to introduce conscription, whilst as a final measure of subjection the imposition of taxation within Turkey was made subject to the control of a Commission to be appointed by Great Britain, France and Italy.

The treaty embodying these drastic terms was signed by the Turkish representatives at Sèvres in August 1920, after pressure had been put upon the Ottomans by the advance of a Greek army to Brusa. The Government of Turkey, however, was now under the control of the energetic and forceful Mustapha Kemal, who refused to ratify the treaty and prepared for armed resistance. Nor was Mustapha Kemal prepared to stand purely on the defensive. The chaos among the Caucasian peoples invited inter-

vention, and in 1920 a Turkish force invaded Armenia. Working in conjunction with the Russian Bolshevik armies, the Turks overran most of Armenia and even advanced into Georgia, capturing Batum in 1921. The Russians now called a halt to the advance of their too successful allies, and when the local Bolsheviks proclaimed a Soviet state in Batum a Russian force proceeded to drive the Turks out of Georgia. In 1921, having arranged a peaceful agreement with Russia, Mustapha Kemal turned boldly to attack the French troops in Cilicia; France showed no desire to enter upon fresh military commitments in the Near East, and before the end of the year a treaty had been arranged by which the French garrisons were withdrawn from Cilicia.

Meanwhile a conference had met in London to discuss possible modifications of the Treaty of Sèvres, and to crush the rising spirit of self-assertion in Turkey the Greek army launched a great offensive towards Angora, where Mustapha Kemal had established his new capital. Successful at first, the Greeks were in 1922 hurled back in rout from Afion Karahissar and Eskishehr, and by September the Turkish forces were in Smyrna.¹ By this time it was obvious that the Allies were unwilling to embark on any costly campaign to restore the situation, and the Turks were so confident of this that they proceeded to attack the Allied troops that were garrisoning the fortifications of the Dardanelles. The British troops under Sir Charles Harrington succeeded in checking an attack on Chanak, and an armistice was arranged pending the holding of a fresh peace conference, which met at Lausanne before the end of 1922.

The Lausanne Conference was marked by dissensions between the Allies which played into the hands of Mustapha Kemal. The British Government was prepared to show a firm front; France was anxious to clear out of the business altogether, and refused even to maintain a bluff of determination. On the day that the Allied terms were handed to the Turkish representatives France notified the Turkish Government that she was prepared to consider less stringent proposals, and this *démarche* completed the confidence of the Turks in their ability to snap their fingers at the joint demands. In July 1923, the Treaty of Lausanne left the whole of Asia Minor to Turkey, extended the Thracian boundary to the Maritza and freed the Turkish state from all Allied control

¹ See p. 138.

except that exercised through the Straits Commission which was to maintain the passage to the Black Sea.

The crisis in the fortunes of Turkey brought about by her defeat in the Great War produced a national leader of remarkable capacity in the person of Mustapha Kemal, an army officer who had distinguished himself in the Dardanelles campaign. Since the year 1908 the old autocratic system centring round the Sultan had been practically dead, and the Ottoman Empire had been ruled by a group of political leaders professedly carrying out the progressive ideas of the "Young Turk" party. Mustapha Kemal was a member of this group, and after the war he rapidly rose to the position of dictator alike of the party and of the nation. In 1919 elections were held for a Parliament of the pre-war type; little interest was shown in these elections and the poll was extremely small. Meanwhile Mustapha Kemal summoned a separate meeting of delegates from towns and provinces to meet at Erzeroum in Armenia to found a new nationalist movement, and in 1920 elections were held to a national congress which was to meet at Angora in the heart of Asia Minor, since Constantinople was still being garrisoned by Allied troops. This congress decided to establish Angora as the capital of Turkey. In 1922 the shadowy reign of the Sultan Mohammed VI was declared at an end, and the Sultan fled to a British ship. The son of the ex-sultan, Abdul Medjid, was allowed to take over the position of "Head of the Church"—or Caliph—held by the Turkish sultans, but after many bitter arguments arising from this appointment the Caliphate was declared abolished in 1924, and Abdul Medjid retired to Switzerland. The Constitution of the new Republic was not finally settled till 1923, when Mustapha Kemal became President and Commander-in-chief of the army at the age of forty-three. In these early days it was by no means certain that Mustapha Kemal would retain his ascendancy; he had many enemies among his own party, and for a time it looked as though he might be ousted by Shukri Bey, the leader of the Opposition to his rule. After the murder of Shukri Bey in 1923 the Opposition was coerced into silence, and Mustapha Kemal was firmly established as the dictator of the new Turkey. The general election of 1923 returned a comprehensive majority for the new Constitution.

When the problems of the frontier and the Constitution were settled, Mustapha Kemal initiated a great campaign for the

revolutionising of Turkish national life. Comprehensive in scope, extending into the economic, the social and the religious spheres, this thorough campaign bears strong points of resemblance both to the reconstruction of Japan after the revolution of 1868 and to the great Soviet effort in Russia. The early years of the movement were marked by a concentration on the religious system of Turkey. The political influence of the Mohammedan Church was reduced to a nullity; the Caliphate was abolished in 1924, and in the same year every religious school in Turkey was closed, Mohammedan and Christian alike. The Christian and Jewish communities were forbidden to appoint their Patriarchs and Rabbis. The sacredness of the Koran was repudiated by the Government, and Mustapha himself was said to have scandalised the faithful by hurling a copy of the holy book across the Council chamber. The Moslem religious code, with its toleration of polygamy, was ruthlessly cut away, and in 1925 even bigamy was prohibited as from the following year. Civil marriage was introduced. The wearing of the veil by women was discouraged, and in the province of Trebizond, where the custom was deep-rooted, its observance was made an offence punishable by imprisonment. As a counterbalancing interference with the male population the traditional fez was prohibited in 1925.

The revolution was carried into cultural spheres. In 1928 a new alphabet was introduced, along with the Arabic numerals used by the western nations. In 1930 numerous towns were renamed to eliminate all traces of foreign nomenclature—Constantinople, which had always been known to the Turks as Stamboul, was now called Istanbul; Angora became Ankara; Smyrna became Izmir—and the use of the new names was enforced by returning to the senders all letters addressed to the old appellations. In 1932 there was a movement to purify the whole Turkish language, words of Persian or Arabic derivation being excluded from the official dictionaries and in many cases replaced by new or less familiar Turkish forms; the changes affected nearly half the literary vocabulary. This strong development of a nationalist spirit led in 1933 to a decree excluding all aliens from a host of trades and professions. In 1934 a uniform system of personal names was enforced; all the old titles—Pasha, Effendi, Bey, and their like—were abolished, and plain *Bay* and *Bayan* became the *citoyen* and *citoyenne* of this new revolution. Mustapha

Kemal himself became Kamal Ataturk—which, being interpreted, means Kamal the Chief Turk. The new Civil Code of 1926 and the grant of votes to women in 1934 were other features of the nationalist reforms.

There was surprisingly little opposition to all these reforms. That the Turks should readily submit to a dictatorship ruling under the forms of parliamentary democracy was understandable, for the Turk had never enjoyed any real political liberty, but the radical attack on social and religious customs which had centuries of tradition behind them seemed calculated to produce profound resentment. It is true that the Kurds of the Assyrian highlands rose in revolt for the faith of Islam in 1925 and again in 1930, but the Kurds were always a troublesome and lawless people. On both occasions they were suppressed, the rebellions being followed by numerous executions. Similar severity was shown after a Dervish rebellion in the regions near Smyrna in 1931. There was plenty of discontent and some plotting among the political leaders who served the dictator, but it is difficult to estimate how far these conspiracies were due to mere personal ambitions. The most sensational of these plots occurred in 1926, when nineteen persons were hanged for conspiring to assassinate Mustapha Kemal. There was also some activity on the part of Communists. The elections to the National Assembly, held every four years, were uniformly satisfactory to the Government, being merely ceremonial nominations of Government candidates. In 1927 there was one contested election, in Constantinople, but the Opposition candidate polled only one vote—presumably his own. At the election of 1931 Mustapha Kemal nominated 287 candidates to be “returned” for the Government party, leaving thirty seats for an Opposition. Of the thirty candidates who appeared to put in for these ten proved objectionable, and they were opposed, the Government winning in each case. At the 1935 election 383 Government supporters—the “Popular Party”—and sixteen “Opposition” members were returned, all unopposed. In 1936 it was decreed that the “Popular Party” was coterminous with the state, the General Secretary of the party being the Minister of the Interior and the presidents of the local branches provincial governors.

Alongside of the destructive work of the dictator, there went on a vigorous campaign of economic construction. In 1933 he

followed the Russian example of instituting a Five Year Plan, the aim being to make Turkey industrially independent of imports. It was significant of Bolshevik progress that the capital required for the initial steps of this Plan was raised by a loan from the Russian Government. In 1935 the Plan was supplemented by a huge electrification scheme on the Russian model. Foreign trade was strictly regulated by the Government, and in 1936 the Turkish mercantile marine was reorganised as a completely state-owned concern.

The foreign policy of Kamal Ataturk was directed to the moderate aim of asserting control over those areas only which possessed a distinctly Turkish population. The final adjustments with Russia surrendered to the Transcaucasian Soviet Republic those Armenian districts that had been seized by Turkish forces in 1921. There was friction with Great Britain over the frontier of the mandated territory of Iraq, but the Turkish claim to Mosul was successfully resisted. There was also friction with Persia for her failure to police the frontier of Kurdistan, over which bands of rebels crossed during the rebellion of 1930, but Persia eventually made arrangements which were satisfactory to Kemal. Further along the frontier there was a long dispute with France over the retention of the district of Alexandretta in the mandated territory of Syria. This was settled to the advantage of France by a treaty of 1929, but the termination of the French mandate and the proclamation of the independent Syrian Republic in 1936 renewed the question in an acute form. After the expulsion of the Greeks from Asia Minor Turkey adopted an attitude of friendliness to her former enemy, and the exchange of minority populations was carried through systematically between the years 1923 and 1932.

Turkey joined the League of Nations in 1932, and it was noticeable that while Germany and Italy were giving examples of unilateral denunciations of treaties Turkey referred both the Alexandretta question and the question of the continuance of the Straits Commission to the League. These applications were made in 1936, and before the end of the year a conference at Montreux had resulted in an international treaty restoring to Turkey the control of the waters between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, with permission to fortify the shores, and with a number of guarantees for the free passage of merchant-ships and

the limitation of the number of warships that each of the Powers was entitled to send through the Straits.

Turkey in 1937 presented the spectacle of yet another nation engaged in a vast process of reconstruction under the planned control of a powerful central Government. In none of the countries where this phenomenon was observable was the importance of the man at the top more conspicuous. The Bolshevik party in Russia found a Stalin to replace its Lenin; and it is not very difficult to name several leaders who might step into the positions of Hitler and Mussolini without seriously modifying the plans of the Nazis and the Fascists. It is difficult, however, to foresee the future of a Turkey bereft of Kamal Ataturk. He appears to stand alone. Active, clever, thoroughgoing in his schemes, Kamal is unique among modern Oriental despots. Sinister stories are told of his treatment of private individuals native and foreign, but his political energy and enthusiasm cannot be disputed. The man who can deliver a speech in Parliament lasting for six days, interrupted only by the usual adjournments of the House, outlining in detail the principles of his past and present policy—a feat achieved by Kamal Ataturk in 1927—cannot be other than an enthusiast.

SYRIA

The leading Arabs of Damascus, believing that the surrender of Turkey to the Allies meant that they were free, offered the crown of Syria to Feisal, a son of Hussein of the Hedjaz, and thus a descendant of the Prophet. They soon learned that they were to be governed by the French as a mandated territory, and a French army drove Feisal from the country. There was strong resistance to the European invaders, and all through the year 1920 there was fighting with Arab bands. Peace was, however, at last restored, and France proceeded to divide Syria into four provinces, Grand Liban, the Jebel Druze, and the Alaouites being separated from Syria proper—the area round Damascus. The object of this partition was to weaken the national opposition to French rule.

The next fifteen years saw a perpetual struggle between the rulers and the ruled. Only in the Lebanon province, where the

population was mainly Christian, was any willingness shown even to co-operate with the French in administering the country. Riots and murders were of frequent occurrence. In 1921 an attempt was made to assassinate General Gouraud, the High Commissioner, and it was unsafe for Frenchmen to wander about the country after dark. After a while, the Government sought to appease the discontent by the grant of Constitutions to all the provinces except the Jebel Druze, where conditions were rather more primitive among the mountain-dwellers than those of the other districts. In 1923 a start was made with the election of a representative council for Syria; the Arabs refused to go to the polls, although the French officials and soldiers drove some of them there by force. Then came a fresh burst of rioting. In 1925 the Druses rose in rebellion. This rising was the signal for a regular national upheaval. The whole of the open country was soon in the hands of the rebels, and even in the capital, with its garrison of French troops, the people took arms and opened fire on the French. General Sarrail had just been appointed commander of the forces, and he took severe measures to restore order. Withdrawing to the neighbouring hills, he subjected the city of Damascus to a bombardment which reduced a great part of the capital to ruins; severe street fighting followed before the insurgents were dispersed.

At this moment there was a sudden change of policy on the part of France. Just at the moment when coercion seemed to be on the point of success, the Government in Paris ordered that conciliation must be attempted. Sarrail was dismissed, and the civilian de Jouvenel arrived as High Commissioner. Whilst the army was allowed to disperse the armed bands that still ranged over the countryside, orders were issued for an election to a Syrian assembly. Again the Arabs boycotted the elections, and the affair was almost a farce; the High Commissioner, however, got together a "Government" from among the more moderate elements among the inhabitants. A third election, ordered in 1928, to select what was specifically called a "Constituent Assembly", was not boycotted; it returned an overwhelming majority for complete independence. The French Government promptly suspended the session. The policy of conciliation utterly failed. Riots and murders continued as before, and it was noteworthy that the Christian Maronites and the

Mohammedans suspended an age-long feud in order to combine against the French.

France at last realised that in a situation of this kind there is no half-way house between stern coercion and complete concession of demands. In 1936 a decision was taken to abandon the country. A treaty, similar in scope to that arranged in the same year between Britain and Egypt, ended the mandate, definite guarantees being included for the retention of French garrisons in certain strategic areas, for an alliance between France and Syria, and—more important because the source of great native opposition—for the separation of Great Lebanon from Syria and for the grant of local autonomy to the Jebel Druze and to the Alaouites—now called Lattakia.

The settlement thus negotiated gave no very firm hopes of real peace. The Arabs still resented the presence of the French garrisons, and many of them believed that further violence would extort from France complete withdrawal from the country. The continued partition of the country also gave cause for discontent, and the first episode in the history of the free republic of Great Lebanon was a rebellion of Mohammedans, accompanied by severe fighting. Turkey, too, threatened complications; her claims to the district of Alexandretta, where a majority of the population were Turks, had been waived by a treaty signed with France in 1928; the abandonment of the mandate was held by Mustapha Kemal to wipe out the conditions on which this treaty had been based. Fortunately for peace, Turkey submitted the question of the future of Alexandretta to the League of Nations instead of sending an invading army across the frontier.

PALESTINE

At the close of the Great War Palestine became a mandated territory of the League of Nations, Great Britain being entrusted with its control. As an attempted solution of the Semitic question which distracted so many European countries and as the result of propaganda by the Zionists—a Jewish society founded at the close of the nineteenth century—it was proposed to make the Holy Land a national home for such members of the Jewish race as chose to go there. A small and poor country, with less than a million inhabitants, it presented great economic possibilities, for

neither its Turkish rulers, nor the Arabs who formed the bulk of its inhabitants, had done very much to develop its agricultural resources. Under the inspiration of Dr Weizmann, the inventor of wood-alcohol, who had put his discovery at the disposal of the British Government during the war, Lord Balfour made the famous declaration of 1917 associated with his name, promising the Jews a National Home in Palestine, though qualifying this offer with a reservation for the rights of the existing inhabitants. The Zionists, whose aim was thus satisfied, proceeded to organise immigration immediately after the war, and in 1920 Sir Herbert Samuel, a prominent English Jew, arrived as High Commissioner.

From the very first this policy antagonised the Arabs. In 1921 there were anti-Jewish riots in Jaffa and elsewhere, and the settlement of Jewish fruit-growers in areas hitherto occupied by pastoral Arabs was accompanied by quarrels and violent acts which necessitated the constant activity of a ubiquitous police. It was intended that the country should be governed by a small Parliament consisting of twelve members chosen by indirect election in two stages and ten officials appointed by the mandatory power. This Constitution was announced in 1922, but when in the following year the elections were held, not only the Mohammedan Arabs but the Christians too refused to take part in them, and the whole business became a farce; the Constitution was suspended, Crown Colony government being introduced.

The Palestine mandate was the most troublesome of all those undertaken by the British. The Government tried hard to be scrupulously fair to both sides, in spite of torrents of abuse and acts of violent aggression. But neither the Arabs nor the Jews were willing to consider any reasonable compromise. To the Jew, the Arab was a lazy and uncivilised savage, an obstacle in the way of progress as well as a historical intruder into the land of the Chosen People. To the Arab, the Jew was a grasping trickster, thrust into a country that had been Arab for centuries, a weakling protected only by the bayonets of the equally foreign British. As the strong Power that had forced these intruders into their old homes the British were detested by the Mohammedans; as diplomatic swindlers who had lured the Jews out under false pretences they were execrated by the Hebrew element at every concession to the Arabs and at every restriction on Jewish activities. There was a constant stream of protests and petitions, first from

one side and then from the other. To make confusion worse confounded, there were internal quarrels among both the parties. The Arab nationalist movement was not a harmonious gathering of the clans; among the Jews the moderate "Revisionist" wing occasionally fought with the "Labour" wing, and in 1934 there was at least one murder to the score of this dispute.

Whatever troubles the immigration of the Jews brought on Palestine and its mandatory ruler, there can be no doubt about the material benefits conferred both by the British Government and by the Jewish settlers. The British have built new roads, opened schools and introduced modern health services, whilst in reconstructing the port of Haifa and negotiating the construction of the pipe-line to bring thither Mesopotamian oil, a great service has been done. The Jews have brought under cultivation thousands of acres of hitherto almost unproductive land, and have built up in Palestine the wealth which enables the Government to undertake its reforms. Few communities have proved themselves so progressive; they have supplemented the Government's educational and health measures by spending more money to improve their own conditions in these respects than the Government has spent on these reforms. Whilst less than a fifth of the Arabs are literate, every Jewish child attends school. When the Jaffa Arabs refused to unload ships arriving at that port, the Jews quietly constructed quays at Tel Aviv, a few miles away, and founded a new port there. In 1926 the Rutenberg Company, in which the British Lord Reading had many shares, initiated a great electrical power scheme in the valley of the Jordan.

The Arab nationalist movement was headed by Haj Amin al Husseini, a young ex-soldier of the Turkish army, and Auni Bey Abdul Hadi, a lawyer who had attended the Paris peace conference of 1919 as a representative of King Feisal. Haj Amin received a life-sentence for his share in the riots of 1920, but Sir Herbert Samuel, as High Commissioner, not only released him from prison but secured his election as Mufti or Head of the Mohammedian Church, although his own people put him only fifth on the list of elected candidates for the office. If the High Commissioner reckoned on the new Mufti's gratitude he was sadly disillusioned, for Haj Amin soon made the Supreme Moslem Council the main centre of anti-Jewish and anti-British agitation. Auni Bey organised the Istiqlal, or Independence party, outside

Church circles and concentrated his efforts on getting rid of the British as a preliminary to the expulsion of the Jews. For a time a moderate wing of the Nationalist movement commanded much support; its leader Nashashibi, the Mayor of Jerusalem, was defeated at the municipal election of 1934 and afterwards sunk into a mere follower of the extreme section.

The disturbances which were never entirely absent from Palestinian life blazed up into wholesale riot and massacre in 1929. The Arabs were eventually put down, but not until 120 Jews had been murdered. On this occasion the crisis was so serious that the Government took on volunteer police from among British tourists in the country. Next year the Government declared a temporary suspension of Jewish immigration, and the result was a wild outburst of Jewish discontent. In 1931 some of the Arab newspapers were suspended and Arab meetings prohibited. Jerusalem meanwhile had become the scene of continuous upheavals resulting from the proximity of the "Wailing Wall"—a Jewish Holy Place—to the central Mosque of the city. In 1933 there was an outburst of rioting directed mainly against the British, and the Government established what was in effect martial law. Then, for a year or so, things went a little more quietly, though sporadic murders of Jews and Arabs were constantly occurring. In 1936 wholesale rioting broke out again, beginning in Jaffa, and this time directed mainly against the Jews. The High Commissioner, Sir Arthur Wauchope, was reluctant to take more than police measures, but events proved too strong for him, and there were eventually 30,000 British troops carrying on a regular war in the hill regions. Meanwhile a general Arab "strike" was declared, shops being closed and labourers refusing to work; this was maintained over most of Palestine for nearly six months. The disturbances were marked by terrible brutalities, women and children being ruthlessly murdered, whilst some Arabs who had refused to assist in the movement were killed by their compatriots. Apart from those shot in action, the British Government took no toll of life from the rebels, though—as in Ireland fifteen years before—the houses of rebels were burnt. The total reported casualties of the rising exceeded 1300, including some 300 killed, the Arabs suffering in the long run heavier losses than the Jews.

Meanwhile a Royal Commission, under the Chairmanship of

Earl Peel, had been appointed to study the whole problem of Palestine and to suggest possible remedies. The Commission was at first boycotted by the Arabs, but later they agreed to give evidence before it. Meanwhile minor disorders continued, and there was a widespread development of brigandage, which exacted its toll of plunder from Arab, Jew and Christian alike. Even quite close to Jerusalem it became unsafe to use the highways at night. In July 1937 the Peel Commission reported in favour of dividing Palestine into three parts—an Arab state in the south-east, a Jewish state in the north-west, and a neutral zone round Jerusalem, with an outlying enclave at Nazareth. The neutral zone, which included the holy places of Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Nazareth, was to remain a mandated territory of the League of Nations and placed under British control. The two other areas were to become independent states.

The district now known as Transjordania had been entrusted along with Palestine to Britain as mandatory Power. Here there was a more homogeneous population of Arabs, who were invited to elect a king. In 1922, after much discussion, Abdullah, the second son of King Hussein of the Hedjaz, was appointed to rule the country, the British adviser exercising the powers of a protectorate. British troops put down a small rebellion against the Emir Abdullah in 1923; in 1925 his dominions were extended by the addition of Maan and Akaba, which brought its boundaries to the head of the Red Sea.

In 1937 Palestine was obviously "in the melting pot". With the abandonment of the British mandate in Iraq, the British protectorate in Egypt and the French mandate in Syria, it became increasingly difficult to maintain European control in the Holy Land. Yet the situation produced by the effective application of the Balfour policy was such that complete withdrawal was dangerous, for the obvious sequel would be a wholesale massacre of Jews. Without a mutual exchange of minority populations the two suggested states of the Peel Commission would provide countless opportunities for racial upheavals. Furthermore, there are British interests in Palestine now that the eastern air-routes traverse the country and the pipe-line goes down to Haifa. As was expected, neither the Jews nor the Arabs accepted the Peel report with anything but protests. Palestine remains perhaps the most knotty problem arising from Britain's many responsibilities.

ARABIA

Before the Great War the Arab race had been divided politically into two parts; the desert centre of the great Arabian peninsula was inhabited by independent tribes, mainly of nomadic character, whilst the outer fringes of Arabia, containing the more fertile and productive lands, had passed under the sway of the Ottoman Empire. Just before the Turkish entry into the war, the province of El Hasa, along the western side of the Persian Gulf, had been overrun by the forces of Ibn Saud, the warlike chieftain of Nejd, but Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine, and the whole of the Red Sea coast were in Turkish hands, whilst the British had their coaling station at Aden, along with the island of Perim in the straits of Bab el Mandeb.

During the war Arab sympathies were generally on the Allied side, and many Arabs fought against the Turks, partly owing to the desire to shake off the Ottoman yoke, partly as a result of the influence of "Lawrence of Arabia", an Englishman of remarkable personality and talent, who had lived for many years among the Arabs. It was generally understood that an Allied victory would be followed by the establishment of Arab independence, a policy favoured by Great Britain. France, however, wished to assert an influence in the Levant which had been pressed intermittently for more than a century, and when French persuasion was reinforced by the liabilities of the Balfour Declaration and the interests of British capital in Mesopotamian oil, the original schemes for an independent Arabia were considerably modified. At Versailles, though the Arab cause had been eloquently pleaded by Lawrence, the Allies established the French mandate in Syria and the British mandate in Mesopotamia, Palestine and Transjordania, leaving the Arabian peninsula, with the exception of Aden, independent. The lopping off of the mandated territories was a bitter disappointment to patriotic Arabs, especially as Wilson's Fourteen Points seemed to have guaranteed them full self-determination and the Syrian Arabs had already set up a king in the person of Feisal, a son of Hussein, King of the Hedjaz. The French expelled Feisal, but Hussein was recognised as ruler of the lands along the Red Sea.

Among the constantly warring tribes of the interior Ibn Saud, a giant in stature as in warfare, was the most powerful chieftain.

His tribesmen of Nejd were members of the Wahabi sect—a Puritan branch of the Mohammedan faith—and a series of wars, partly tribal, partly religious, gradually extended his rule over the whole of Arabia. In 1921 he conquered the tribes of the Jebel Shamar, to the north of his original dominions, and his raiders had to be bombed out of Mesopotamia by the British air force. In 1923 he created a great stir by massacring a caravan of orthodox pilgrims on its way to Mecca. In 1925 he attacked King Hussein of the Hedjaz and drove him from his dominions.

Hussein, who claimed descent from the Prophet Mohammed himself, and who had occupied the position of Governor of Mecca under the Turks, was an autocratic and eccentric old man, who had himself proclaimed Caliph, or head of the Islamic Church, on the expulsion of the former Caliph from Turkey by Mustapha Kemal. In 1925 his forces were no match for the Wahabi sectaries, who overran his dominions and deposed him, establishing a new capital at Jeddah, on the Red Sea. Hussein had accepted a treaty from Great Britain establishing a virtual protectorate, but Ibn Saud refused to renew it, and Britain recognised the complete independence of the Hedjaz in 1927 by the Treaty of Jeddah. Various outlying tribes maintained independence of Ibn Saud for some years, particularly the Emir of Sanaa, in the extreme south-west, who bore the euphonious name of Yahya, and who made himself a pest to his Arab neighbours and to the British administrators of the Aden hinterland. In 1928 British aeroplanes bombed his tribesmen out of the raided area, and shortly after he was reduced to submission by Ibn Saud. The ruler of what was now called "Saudi Arabia" rested on no easy throne; he had to face conspiracies and rebellions, even among his original supporters of Nejd, and in 1935 an attempt was made to assassinate him in a Meccan mosque. Like his predecessor Hussein, he introduced some modern innovations to the Hedjaz, including a line of motor-coaches to convey pilgrims to Mecca, but his position remained that of the temporary head of a collection of warlike and mutually quarrelsome tribes.

IRAQ

The victorious campaign of General Maude had left the ancient land of Mesopotamia in the hands of a British army of occupation, and as a mainly Arab region it was earmarked for separation from the Ottoman Empire. European interests in the country were so strong that the Allies felt a reluctance to grant independence to the Arab population, who had no experience of self-government beyond the service of numerous local people in the Turkish administration. In 1920 it was finally decided that Mesopotamia should become a mandated territory under the League of Nations, and that Great Britain should be the mandatory power. The British Government intended to establish an Arab king and an advisory Council of Arabs, whilst a considerable force of troops was to be maintained in the region, particularly to prevent the Turks from asserting their claim to the province of Mosul, where the rich oilfields were of cardinal importance to European industry.

The news that there was to be a British mandate instead of complete independence provoked an outburst of fury among the native Arabs. A serious rebellion broke out, and a British force was besieged in Samawah on the Euphrates. The superior forces of the British put down the rebellion, but only after 400 British had been killed, along with about four times that number of Arab rebels. The rebellion, however, did not seriously modify the plans of the mandatory; in 1921 the Arab leaders were asked to elect a king, and an Arab Cabinet was formed. A local candidate for the crown who was notoriously hostile to the mandate was deported from the country, and the Arabs chose Feisal, son of the King of the Hedjaz and himself ex-king of Syria, as their ruler. A treaty was signed between Feisal and the British Government recognising the supervisory control of the mandatory.

The new kingdom, which was given the local name of Iraq, was likely to be faced with trouble. Not only was there internal agitation against the mandate but all the neighbouring rulers were hostile. The Persian Government objected to the rule of Feisal as a member of the Sunni branch of Mohammedanism, the Persians belonging to the Shiah group. The French were not pleased with the elevation to another throne of the man they had expelled from Syria. Ibn Saud, who was rapidly becoming the

dominant power in Arabia, had a lifelong feud with the family of Feisal, and at once began raiding across the very indefinite frontier. But the main trouble was expected from Turkey, especially after the defeat of the Greeks in Asia Minor set free the forces of Mustapha Kemal for other fields of action. The bone of contention with Turkey was the province of Mosul, where the bulk of the inhabitants were neither Arab nor Turkish, but Kurds. Kurdish feeling preferred the Turks to the Arabs, particularly since the Iraqi Arabs were under European control. The Mosul Kurds elected members to the Turkish Parliament in 1923, and in 1924 a force of Turks invaded the province. After destructive bombing by British aeroplanes, the Turks agreed to submit the question of Mosul to the League of Nations, which decided on a frontier which gave the lion's share of the province to Iraq. The province of Mosul contained about three-quarters of a million out of the three millions who inhabited the Kingdom of Iraq, and to secure impartial administration the League, in its decision of 1925, made it a condition that the British mandate should continue for a quarter of a century, unless at some earlier date Iraq obtained recognition as an independent state from the League of Nations.

Internal agitation was serious. Agitators were arrested all through the years 1921 to 1923, and when a two-chamber Parliament was created the elections led to violent uproar. The moderate elements, however, supported by King Feisal, who regarded the British as too strong to expel, triumphed, and when the Parliament met in 1924 the treaty with Great Britain was confirmed, though two of its leading champions in Parliament were assaulted by a mob in the streets of Bagdad.

The British Government was by no means enthusiastic about the retention of the mandate. During the five years after hostilities with the Ottoman Empire ceased, Britain had spent £150,000,000 on Mesopotamia, and the expense of a large army of occupation was resented by champions of economy at home. A new Constitution was drawn up in conjunction with the recently elected Parliament, and when this was approved a fresh election was arranged in 1925. The difficulties of applying western democratic ideas to this part of the world at once appeared, for it transpired that the tribal chiefs had secured the return of exaggerated figures for the populations of their tribes, in order to secure a larger

proportion of seats in Parliament; the elections were in consequence postponed. It was not until 1927 that the new Parliament was got together, and there at once broke out a religious dispute; the Shiah Mohammedans objected to a Cabinet consisting of Sunni sectaries and called on the British to interfere. The limitations of parliamentary government were again illustrated by the confession of the Minister of Finance that he could not understand his own Finance Bill—which was, nevertheless, passed. Under these circumstances, Britain was willing to weaken her grip on the country by a second treaty, which recognised Iraq as a sovereign and independent state within the restrictions of the mandate, whilst the British garrisons were reduced to air squadrons. From this time onwards the British were looking forward to a termination of a rather onerous and expensive mandate, in spite of the added interest created by the development of the Mosul oilfield from 1927 onwards. In 1929 Britain agreed to advise the League of Nations to accept Iraq as an independent member-state at the termination of three years. A third treaty in 1930 laid it down that if Iraq became completely independent she would accept a British alliance, would assist Britain in war, and would allow the existence of British air bases in the country. At the same time the maintenance of special British judges for cases in which a Briton was concerned was guaranteed for a further ten years. At the expiry of the three years the League of Nations admitted Iraq as a free state, in 1932, Iraq giving guarantees for the protection of the minorities within the country.

Throughout the period of the British mandate Iraq was troubled by Kurdish risings and by Arab raids from Ibn Saud's territories. Turkey eventually accepted the Mosul settlement of the League of Nations in 1926, mainly because Italy was hostile and France would give no support to the Turkish claims. There were Kurdish rebellions in 1925, 1930, 1931, and 1932, and the Kurds expressed strong objection to the departure of the British. Ibn Saud's Wahabis gave conspicuous trouble in 1925 and in 1928.

The establishment of independence was almost at once followed by a development which made many observers regret the termination of the mandate. There were many thousands of Assyrian Christians in the Mosul area, and these had served against the Kurdish rebels on several occasions. As soon as the British mandate was a thing of the past, a savage persecution of these

Christians began, and many fled the country. In 1933, a body of 1500 of these Assyrian Christians tried to cross the frontier into Syria, but the French authorities refused to have them. The Iraqi authorities then refused to readmit them unless they gave up their weapons, and as they refused to do so a fight took place, in which the refugees got the worst of it. This was the signal for a general massacre of the Assyrian Christians, in which both Iraqis and Kurds—who incidentally had run a small rebellion of their own earlier in the year—took part. Much of the slaughter was perpetrated by Government troops, and on the return of these battalions to Bagdad they were given an official welcome. King Feisal, who was away on a visit to Europe, hurried home to try and reverse this intolerant movement and to prevent further atrocities, but he died immediately after his arrival in his capital.

Feisal was succeeded by his son Ghazi, aged twenty, who had been educated in England at Harrow School. He could do little or nothing for the remnants of the Assyrians, and though the League of Nations tried hard to arrange a peaceful emigration for them—even as far away as Brazil—no satisfactory arrangements could be carried to completion.

The politics of free Iraq gave no more hopeful impression to the outside world. The general election of 1935 was followed by charges of wholesale gerrymandering of votes by the Government, and a rebellion broke out on the lower Euphrates. The rebels were put down with great severity, and a number of executions followed. A fresh general election was then held, and the new Parliament decided to introduce conscription. In the following year a revolution took place. General Bekir Sidki, the chief figure of the Assyrian massacres of 1933, demanded a change of Government, and emphasised his demands by dropping first leaflets and then bombs on Bagdad. The Cabinet hurriedly resigned and fled the capital, one Minister being caught and murdered. Bekir Sidki then became virtual dictator of Iraq, though King Ghazi remained on the throne. After a few months of rule Bekir Sidki was assassinated by a soldier at the Mosul aerodrome in 1937.

Mesopotamia is still dominated by the old Arab ideas. The primitive individualism of the local tribes, the intolerance towards other religions, the dominance of sheer force in politics, savagery in punishment of opponents—these are conspicuous features of

free Iraq. Since the termination of the mandate the real rulers of the country have been the soldiers, and even before Sidki's dictatorship the army leaders were the most important persons in Iraqi politics. A party of "Opposition" exiles, who fled from Sidki's tender mercies, lives in Egypt awaiting the opportunity to return and begin another revolution. Meanwhile the commercial development of the country is slowly progressing, and the great pipe-line conveying Mosul oil to the Mediterranean at Tripoli and Haifa, begun in 1931, was opened in 1935. It remains to be seen whether King Ghazi will be able to assert his own personality in the public affairs of a politically backward country.

PERSIA

At the time of the Great War, the ancient Empire of Persia seemed to have completely lost its identity. The inhabitants, of whom no proper census had ever been taken, did not exceed ten or twelve millions, and they were scattered over a huge area in feudal tribes that paid practically no attention to the Imperial Government at Teheran. The Shah Ahmad, in fact, had about as much power as the Great Moguls of India in the days of Clive and Hastings. Economic conditions were mediaeval, and the absence of efficient transport facilities made local famines serious at times when other parts of Persia were enjoying good harvests. In 1907 Great Britain and Russia had partitioned the country into Spheres of Influence, a Russian portion in the north, a British portion in the south-east, and a middle portion common to both. The Bolshevik upheaval in Russia gave Britain the opportunity of extending her influence over the whole country, and in 1919 the Shah Ahmad accepted a British Protectorate. The Russian Bolsheviks, however, did not accept this situation without a struggle, and Soviet forces marched from the Caucasus region round the southern shores of the Caspian, establishing a local Soviet Republic at Resht.

In 1921 an astonishing revolution took place in Persia. There existed no large educated class to promote Persian nationalism, and the feudal aristocracy was too absorbed in managing local estates to find time for an anti-foreign crusade. The task of re-

generating Persia and saving the country from the foreigner was undertaken by an individual enthusiast of remarkable skill and statesmanship, a young army officer named Riza Khan. Marching into the capital with a few thousand cavalry behind him, he forced the Shah to take him into the Cabinet as War Minister and Commander-in-Chief. In this position he soon made the other Ministers understand that they must take orders from him, and in 1923 he was formally installed as Prime Minister. Riza Khan's first step was to get the Shah to denounce the recent treaty with Britain by which the protectorate had been established. Though there were British garrisons in several parts of Persia, and even in Teheran, the Government had no wish to undertake a war, and Great Britain acquiesced in the situation. In 1922 Persia signed a treaty of alliance with Russia, after expelling the Soviet authorities from Persian territory. Riza Khan then turned to the internal situation, where the most urgent needs were order and financial stability. To secure the latter he called in an American adviser, Dr Paul, who was placed in charge of the state finances in 1922, being replaced shortly afterwards by an American financial committee under the direction of Dr Millspaugh. To secure the former Riza Khan undertook a series of military campaigns against tribes that refused to pay taxes or that tolerated brigandage among their members. The turbulent north-west, where Kurds and Persians showed an equal capacity for lawlessness, was subdued after mountain campaigns in 1921 and 1922; in 1924 the Sheik of Mohammerah, who ruled the upper shores of the Persian Gulf as an almost independent prince, was defeated; in 1925 the Turcoman tribes of the north were reduced to submission, seven of their leaders being hanged.

The Shah Ahmad left Persia altogether in 1923, leaving the entire government in the hands of Riza Khan, and settled in France, refusing to go back to his Empire. Under these circumstances Riza Khan summoned a national assembly and had himself proclaimed Shah. The assembly contained 257 Government supporters and an Opposition of three. The development of nationalism was continued. In 1928 the capitulations under which foreigners accused of breaches of the law were tried by special courts with European judges, were abolished, the Powers agreeing to the change. Foreign assistance in financial administration was continued, for even in regenerated Persia financial competence

and honesty were rare—in 1933, for instance, the Shah's trusted Minister Timurtash Khan was sent to jail for three years as a result of corruption and embezzlement. When Dr Millspaugh's term of office expired in 1927 he refused to continue under the proposed new conditions, under which he would be subordinated to the control of the native Finance Minister. Eventually a new adviser was found in the German Dr Lindenblatt. In 1932 the Shah took the extreme step of cancelling the concession formerly granted to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company—the greatest British commercial interest in the country—although it had still some thirty years to run. There were great national rejoicings to celebrate this blow at the foreigner, but on the protest of the British Government the matter was referred for settlement to the League of Nations. In the following year the question was amicably settled by the signature of a new agreement which was to last until the year 1993. In 1935 the name of the state was changed from Persia to Iran, a term which has a somewhat wider geographical significance than the former. In 1933 a decree forbade Government officials and army officers from attending receptions given by foreigners.

There were occasional rebellions against the new Shah, but as there was no real national unity among the malcontents, each could be dealt with as a local and tribal affair. A pretender to the throne headed one such rebellion in 1926, but soon fled to Iraq. Rebellions round Shiraz and Isfahan were suppressed in 1929, as was one at Sarbaz on the Baluchi frontier in the following year. The year 1931 was noted as being the first since the establishment of Riza Khan's rule in which it was not necessary to send a military expedition to deal with rebels of some kind or other. In 1934 a rising of the Bakhtiaris in the north-east was checked by the arrest and execution of eight local chiefs for conspiracy.

Riza Khan gave considerable attention to economic problems. He brought machinery from Russia and established native cotton-manufactures. He arranged for the construction of a new motor-road between Teheran and Iraq and constructed a railway from the Caspian to the Persian Gulf—at the time of his accession to power Persia possessed but 350 miles of railway for an area seven times the size of Great Britain. Negotiations with the League of Nations for the suppression of opium growing broke down owing to the demand of Persia that a change of crop should be

encouraged by a guarantee of low tariffs against Persian exports in sufficient countries to make the transfer profitable.

In his isolation from any great political party or nationalist movement Riza Khan resembles rather the old type of oriental despot than a modern plebiscitary dictator. Even Mustapha Kemal had at his disposal a fair leavening of educated and westernised Turks in his efforts to bring his country into line with progressive states. In Persia there is even more danger that, with the demise of the autocrat, there will be a reversion to the somnolent effeteness of the old Shahs and the tribal nomadism of the outlying provinces. Education—largely under the direction of French experts—is making some headway, but Persia has still a long way to go before it can be called a “modern” nation.

AFGHANISTAN

The six or seven million tribesmen who looked up to the Amir of Kabul as their sovereign have shown a reluctance to abandon their old conditions of life stronger than has asserted itself in any other country. The hardy mountaineers wish not only to be free from foreign control but to maintain the traditional social and economic institutions of the land. Neither Britain nor Russia has shown an inclination to undertake the difficult task of establishing political control of the country, for the experience of the nineteenth century has warned off would-be conquerors, even in these days of the aeroplane and the machine-gun. Domestic politics have remained stormy, with rival candidates for the throne and frequent civil wars. The tribes of the east have also continued their inveterate habit of raiding the adjacent territories of the Indian Empire whenever an opportunity seems to present itself, and several petty expeditions have had to be sent from Indian cantonments to deal with these wily and skilful raiders.

A raid on a larger scale than usual took place in 1919, so large, in fact, that it was regarded as a national exploit. British planes bombed Jalalabad and Kabul until the Amir's Government sued for peace, which was arranged before the end of the year. During this year there was a change of Amir in Afghanistan; the Amir Habibullah was murdered by his brother Nasrullah, who was sent to prison for life as a result, while Habibullah's son Amanullah became Amir. Amanullah showed the same desire to westernise

his country as appeared among other oriental rulers at this time; he opened new schools, he tried to enforce conscription for a regular army; he advocated an improvement in the position of women. After an extended European tour, Amanullah decreed compulsory education, secular law, and other reforms in 1928, and when the tribal Mullahs objected and advised the people not to obey the new decrees, he had four of them executed. There had already been a small rebellion in the Khost district south of Kabul in 1924; the execution of the Mullahs provoked a much wider revolt. Kabul and Jalalabad were besieged by the rebels, and though the Amir was at first able to hold his own against them, in 1929 his resistance collapsed and, after trying to save his throne by a revocation of all the recent innovations, Amanullah abdicated in favour of his brother Inayatullah.

The rebels, however, were not satisfied with this submission. The leader of the western rebels, Habibullah, expelled the new Amir and raised himself to the throne at Kabul. Amanullah promptly revoked his abdication, and raised a force at Kandahar. Yet another candidate for the throne appeared in the person of Ahmad Ali, who declared himself Amir at Jalalabad, but his supporters soon went over to Habibullah's side. Amanullah advanced on Kabul but was defeated at Ghazni; after a second defeat at Makur he fled the country and Habibullah entered Kandahar. The opposition to Habibullah now found a new leader in Nadir Khan, who advanced on Kabul from Jalalabad; after a reverse at Gandamak, he continued his advance, defeated Habibullah's forces outside Kabul and captured the city. In the retreat of the former garrison Habibullah was captured by his enemy and promptly executed. Nadir Khan was then proclaimed Amir.

Nadir Shah, as he now called himself, confirmed the revocation of Amanullah's laws and was able to hold the throne for four years, in spite of rebellions in the southern portion of the country. Then, in 1933, Nadir Shah was assassinated at a school prizegiving by the servant of an executed rebel. His son Zahir Khan, aged twenty, succeeded to the throne. Since then Afghanistan has remained peaceful, and no further attempts have been made to westernise the people. In 1934, however, Afghanistan took one step to come into line with other states by entering the League of Nations.

SIAM

The Kingdom of Siam, with somewhat less than ten million inhabitants, has long lain remote from the general stream of world-politics. Europeans enjoyed similar privileges of "extra-territoriality" as in China, but during the decade following the Great War these were given up. As regards the defeated countries of the war they were cancelled in 1919; America voluntarily gave up her claims to special treatment in 1920 and by 1927 the other Powers had fallen into line with America.

The economic crisis provoked disturbances in Siam as in so many other countries, and a small educated minority of intellectuals raised a rebellion in Bangkok in 1932, extorting from King Prajadhipok a Constitution framed on European lines. A conservative reaction led to a rising in 1933 and the abolition of this Constitution, but—led by the energetic Luang Pradit—the reformers again seized power within a few months. The Siamese revolution bears considerable similarity to the Chinese Kuo Min Tang movement, on which it was to a certain extent modelled.

In the new national assembly half the members were elected by universal suffrage, which was extended to both sexes; the other half were nominated by the Crown. It was provided that not later than the year 1942 the whole assembly would be popularly elected. King Prajadhipok did not take kindly to the new system, and, after further quarrels with the revolutionary leaders, he abdicated the throne in favour of his nephew Ananda in 1935.

CHINA

It is easier to understand the foreign relations of China than it is to grasp even the elements of her domestic politics. For some centuries the enormous Empire had been governed on strictly traditional lines from Peking by the Manchu dynasty. In 1911 a "modernist" party, known as the "Young China" group, effected a revolution in Peking; the Emperor was deposed and a Republic declared. For five or six years after that China remained apparently united under a President and a Parliament, the dominant personalities of the new China being the President Yuan-shi-kai, and the active modernist agitator Dr Sun Yat-Sen,

who had once been the centre of a scandal in London when the Chinese Embassy engineered his kidnapping in Piccadilly. Under the serene surface of the early days of the Republic the provincial governors, who were heads of both civil and military administration, became more and more independent, and the local armies soon became less detachments of an Imperial force than the private retainers of the provincial chiefs. Then, in 1917, a civil war broke out between two factions at Peking, and various local governors joined in. When the European Great War ended, the situation, to put it in an extremely simplified form, was that two rival Chinese Governments existed, one at Peking and the other at Canton, whilst over the greater part of China the real rulers were now the provincial governors, each with his own system of administration and with his own private army.

From that time onwards China was the scene of almost continuous civil war, in which two, three or four rival Governments contested for mastery. The details of this series of struggles are of little interest or importance, either to the European student or to the majority of Chinese. For in no other country of the world is man so little of a political animal as he is in China. The three or four hundred million inhabitants of this vast Empire have undergone no such regeneration as was experienced by the very much smaller population of Japan in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The civilisation of China is intensely conservative, and its conservatism finds no place for either politics or patriotism. The political and administrative systems are regarded, like the geography, the geology and the climate, as part of a normal framework in which the only scope for self-expression and self-assertion lies in prosecuting the interests of the family or of the individual. The communal consciousness in China has never extended beyond the family, which absorbs all the interest and devotion which are elsewhere shared with local, racial and national patriotisms. The small westernised element of "Young China", Dr Sun Yat-Sen, and the Chinese Communists, is an alien importation, barely understood and regarded with apathy by the masses. The contacts with western civilisation have naturally developed a small modernist group, but the fact that this small group is the only one to make itself vocal to the outside world must not blind the student to the fact that it represents a tiny minority. Even devastating civil war leaves no political feeling behind it; if the mandarins

in the course of their quarrels let loose a brutal soldiery to plunder and massacre, it is just a tragic misfortune; one must shrug one's shoulders and start again patiently to amass a store of wealth. After all, the frequent dearths and droughts, and in many provinces the floods, cause even more widespread destruction of life and property; the passage of a marauding army is a somewhat similar catastrophe.

Over a people so thoroughly apathetic to politics are placed a number of wealthy mandarins who have their own family fish to fry, and to these politicians have lately been added the small group of modernist reformers. In the history of Europe racial conflict against a foreign invader has been the main cause of the development of national patriotism; in China the constant aggressions of the great European Powers and of the modernised Japanese have provoked something in the nature of a Chinese patriotism, but in the provinces of the interior, where foreign influence has penetrated but little, even this crude patriotism is absent. A further obstacle to the development of anything resembling the patriotism of the western peoples is the fact that the Chinese Empire—in area nearly as large as Europe—contains almost as many separate races as Europe itself. The persistence of the ideographic writing is due mainly to this diversity of peoples, for without a form of writing in which the signs depict ideas instead of sounds administrators would have to learn a couple of dozen languages before they could make themselves understood by educated people from the rest of China. The alternative would be the adoption of a foreign tongue of universal application, like the mediaeval Latin, or the later diplomatic French in Europe, but this solution has not found favour among the Chinese.

Here, then, is a mass of different races, steeped in an ancient and intensely conservative civilisation, producing large crops by antique agricultural methods and so prolific that the Malthusian pressure of population on the means of subsistence leaves an average standard of poverty. Almost everywhere the women are regarded as mere chattels of the males; not 1 per cent of the people can read a newspaper or a political pamphlet. Hence the politics of China are the concern of a tiny minority of the people. It can be well understood that a country peopled by races so apathetic to forms of government should present a great temptation to states that are looking for opportunities of expansion,

whether nationalist in aim, as in the case of Japan, or crusading in spirit as in the case of Communist Russia.

At the time of the Versailles Treaty there were two Chinese Governments, one in the south—supported by the President, Li Yuan-Hung, and by the majority of the old Chinese Parliament—and the other in the north, supported by the Prime Minister, Tuan Chi-Jui, and by a new Parliament elected in 1918. Both these Governments were represented at the Paris peace conference. The Allies treated the Chinese claims to regain at least the former German colony at Kiao-Chow with scant consideration, and the Versailles Treaty awarded the lost German possession to Japan. The Chinese delegates therefore left Paris and did not sign the treaty; a separate peace with Germany was arranged some months later. A year after the Paris Conference there were four Chinese Governments, Dr Sun Yat-Sen breaking away from the southern Government and Chang Tso-Lin, Governor of Manchuria, breaking away from the northern one. With the capture of Canton by Sun Yat-Sen and the capture of Peking by Chang Tso-Lin the two rebels swallowed up the former Governments and became for the moment the rulers of south and north China respectively. In 1922 General Wu Pei-Fu expelled Chang from Peking, and General Chen Chung-Min repelled Sun from Canton; in this year Wu summoned the old Parliament of 1917 to meet again at Peking like a kind of "Rump". In 1923 confusion became worse confounded: a general named Wang persuaded the "Rump" to move to Shanghai, where he set up his own Government; Marshal Tsao-Kun promptly bribed a hundred of the members to return to Peking and—at the price of £500 per vote—got himself elected President of China; General Wu was still ruling in the north-west; Chang was ruling in Manchuria; Sun Yat-Sen was turning Chen out of Canton again. In 1924 another candidate for power appeared in the person of Feng Yu-Hsiang, the "Christian General", who married a Y.W.C.A. secretary, introduced Cromwellian Puritanism into his army, and made his troops sing "Onward, Christian Soldiers" in Chinese when going into battle. Feng expelled the corrupt Marshal Tsao-Kun from the Presidency and "restored" President Tuan.

These civil wars were not usually conducted in the spirit of the Christian general. The troops of the ambitious mandarins, badly

disciplined and often short of pay, carried a veritable reign of terror with them wherever they went. The unfortunate peasantry and townsmen were robbed and ill-treated, torture being often employed to extort admissions of the existence of hidden stores of food or money. Food supplies were eaten up by the ravenous hordes and at times wantonly burnt, whole districts suffering from famine in consequence. Meanwhile the "Tuchuns"—the provincial governors—retained the imperial taxes in their own hands and the ephemeral Governments at Peking and elsewhere were bankrupt. Nor were the plundering war-lords true to each other; as in the English Wars of the Roses, examples of treachery were legion. No important share of power could be delegated to a subordinate General without the risk of his using it to elevate himself to a position superior to that of his commander. The same troops changed sides three or four times in as many years, and fought with equal brutality whoever was their temporary master. The foreign settlements in the "treaty ports" were crowded with refugees bringing their portable wealth out of harm's reach. In this chaos of unprincipled fighting the proclamation of a new "Constitution" at Peking in 1924 was a mere farce.

It was not until 1926 that any of the Chinese Governments made sufficient headway to give the appearance of becoming effective over the greater part of the country. At the beginning of that year Peking was in the hands of Feng, the Christian general; Chang controlled Manchuria and the Shantung peninsula; Wu was established in central China; the successors of Sun Yat-Sen held the provinces round Canton; and the western provinces were each practically independent under their Tuchuns. Sun Yat-Sen had died in 1925, being almost canonised by his supporters. His party was the only one that could claim to represent any real principle—apart from the small Communist party that Russian agents had been organising for some years. The "Nationalist Party"—known as the Kuo Min Tang—focused the opposition to foreign interference and possessed in the literary works of Dr Sun Yat-Sen a political creed of western type. Shortly before his death, Dr Sun had arranged co-operation with the growing Communist party, which was now being organised by Michael Borodin, an agent of Moscow. During the year 1926 the Canton army, much better trained and organised than most Chinese forces, and led by General Chiang Kai-Shek, began a march

northward, overrunning the districts between Canton and Hankow and declaring Hankow the new capital of China, whilst a force working along the east coast reached Hangchow, a hundred miles from Shanghai. Next year, 1927, the coast army entered Shanghai, whilst Nanking was occupied by the main force.

The Nationalist army now turned to invade the northern provinces, where during the past year Chang and Wu had expelled Feng from Peking and driven him into the north-west. Chiang Kai-Shek was held up for some time at Su-Chow, where strenuous fighting against the forces of Wu and Chang resulted, after many changes of fortune and heavy casualties, in the occupation of that city by the Nationalists. The southern capital was now shifted to Nanking, and 1928 saw another desperate struggle between the southern armies, dominated by Chiang Kai-Shek, and the northern armies, dominated by Chang Tso-Lin of Manchuria. In the battle of Tsi-ning, about a hundred miles north of Su-Chow, the northerners were routed, and Chiang Kai-Shek pressed on to Peking. Meanwhile Chang of Manchuria had been blown up by a bomb during a railway journey, and his son, Chang Hsueh-Liang, was glad to make peace with the victorious southerners, retaining his province of Manchuria. Chiang Kai-Shek now declared Nanking the capital of united China, and the name of Peking—which means “Northern capital”—was changed to Peiping—meaning “Northern Peace”. Chiang Kai-Shek was elected President of China by the Kuo Min Tang party leaders, and his appointment was recognised by all the provinces except those of the far west. These distant provinces had their own catalogue of horrors during the year 1928, a Mohamedan revolt in Kan Su being suppressed only after wholesale massacres which were reported to have depopulated the province to the extent of nearly 200,000 people.

The triumph of Chiang Kai-Shek was marked by a split between the Kuo Min Tang and their Communist allies. In 1927, after three years of fairly cordial co-operation, the Communists declared their inability to support the Nationalists unless so directed by the Comintern at Moscow, to which they professed allegiance. Fighting broke out between Communists and Nationalists at Hankow and elsewhere. The usual atrocities were committed on both sides, a “Red Terror” being succeeded by a “White Terror”. The last Communist force was crushed after three days’ desperate

street-fighting in Canton at the end of the year, and the Russian organisers of the Soviet party fled the country.

Chiang Kai-Shek gave the appearance of being able to provide the Chinese Empire with a more stable and powerful government than any of the previous victors in the long struggle. His army was a very large one; his enemies had been routed with immense slaughter; two-thirds of China had submitted to him. In addition, though the Kuo Min Tang was severely criticised for its failure to live up to the principles always urged by its founder Sun Yat-Sen and for its neglect of the interests of the poorer classes, the dominant party at least represented more of a progressive policy than the various war-lords who had hitherto come somewhere near the control of China. The nationalist ideals of the Kuo Min Tang also caught up the rising tide of exasperation among influential classes in the eastern provinces against the aggressions of the Japanese. It might be hoped, too, that the war-lords would have reached that stage of exhaustion and disappointment at the net results of their wars which made the English barons an easy prey for the vigorous methods of King Henry VII.

The Nanking Government had not been established long, however, in its rule over China before the usual rebellions took place. In 1929 a general revolted at Hankow and was promptly defeated and driven out by Chiang Kai-Shek. Then another revolt took place in the extreme south, which Chiang likewise suppressed after some hard campaigning. The rebels here took on an idealist complexion, calling themselves the "Reorganisation Party". 1930 saw a serious rebellion in the north, led—for a change—by a civilian, Yen, Governor of Shan-Si. The rebels claimed to have a quarter of a million men in the field; the Government brought 200,000 to suppress them. After an initial success of the rebels at Tsinan in the Shantung province, young Chang of Manchuria marched south with his army. It was believed that he had come to help the rebels, but to the general surprise he declared for the Government and enabled Chiang Kai-Shek to defeat the rebel army. Meanwhile the remnants of the southern rebel force were still causing trouble in the far south, whilst bands of brigands, calling themselves "Communists", were spreading misery along the Yang-Tse valley. In 1931 a section of the Kuo Min Tang set up a new "Nationalist Party" in Canton, but in view of the Japanese attack in Manchuria came

to a peaceable settlement with the Nanking Government. By this time the country seemed to have settled down sufficiently for the consolidation of the new Government by the issue of a Constitution in 1931, which, vaguely parallel to the Fascist and Nazi Constitutions in Italy and Germany, recognised the Kuo Min Tang party as the governing body of China.

Meanwhile the official Communist party had raised its head again. After the "White Terror" of 1927 Communism had degenerated into an excuse for general banditry, and the Russian organisers had fled the country. During 1931 Russian organisers returned, and during the following year a solid block of territory lying along the middle course of the Yang-Tse was organised on Soviet lines. Attempts to suppress the movement led to a rebellion, which the Japanese advance in Manchuria prevented Chiang Kai-Shek from putting down. To add to Chiang's troubles another revolt occurred at Foo-Chow in 1933, and the main Government forces had to be diverted against the various rebels. The Communists had advanced to the east coast, linking up with the separate force of Foo-Chow rebels, but in a battle at Amoy the rebels were defeated, and after a second victory over the Foo-Chow force in 1934 the latter group of rebels dispersed. Chiang now turned against the Communist area, and after desperate fighting in the Min Kiang valley above Foo-Chow the rebels were driven westwards to the lands round the upper course of the Yang-Tse. Chiang concentrated two large armies against them, one from the north and the other from the south, in 1935. After an initial victory at Tsun Yi, the Communists were heavily defeated in a two-days battle at Kwei Yang and their army retreated northwards towards the Mongolian frontier. In 1936 there was a recrudescence of Communist rebellion in their old centre on the Yang-Tse, whilst the force that had fled northwards collected reinforcements from among the Mongolians and invaded the Hwang-Ho valley, an area in which they had hitherto not been seen. Both movements were checked; the southern Communists retiring into the Yun Nan mountains and the northern army—after a raid on Ping Yang—withdrawing into Mongolia.

Apart from the Communist rebellion and the revolt at Foo-Chow there was little active rebellion in China after 1931. There were some minor civil wars between quarrelsome generals, and

in 1933 there was a fierce war in the distant country of Sian Kiang—or Chinese Turkestan—between the two races of Tungans and Turkis, and of both with the Chinese authorities, order being restored in this far western dominion in 1934. Chiang Kai-Shek came very near eclipse in 1936 when, during a visit to Chang of Manchuria—who was staying at Si An near the Hwang Ho—he found himself made prisoner by his host. After keeping the President for a fortnight, Chang changed his mind and released his prisoner; the sequel was a formal sentence of ten years' imprisonment on Chang and an immediate pardon. Chang of Manchuria seems to have been a vacillating person; in 1930 he could have overthrown Chiang Kai-Shek by joining Yen's rebels, but at the last moment decided to support the Government, and now he abandoned his grip on the President after getting him caged.

It was a China torn by civil war, distracted by political and personal feuds and often divided between two or more separate and hostile Governments that was called upon to face the greatest menace of foreign conquest that had troubled her for centuries. The compact, racially united, and modernised Empire of Japan was now acting the part of England in the Hundred Years' War, with China in the role of mediaeval France. The old Russian danger, now in Communist guise, still threatened from the north, whilst the Great Powers, with their treaty rights and their possessions round the eastern coast, formed another factor in the great shadow of the "foreign devil" that loomed over China.

The refusal of the Allies to return the ex-German colony of Kiau-Chow to China at Versailles provoked a wave of enmity against the new ruler of the port. There was a boycott of Japanese goods in many cities of China. Within three years, however, there was a surprising turn for the better in Sino-Japanese relations. This was due to the action of the United States, which having many matters of dispute with Japan and professing a firm intention of checking Japanese aggression in the neighbouring lands, initiated a great naval construction programme and gave assurances to China that America would not stand idly by and watch the Japanese extend their possessions on the mainland of Asia. In 1921 negotiations between America and Japan were opened at Washington, where the ambassadors of Great Britain and the United States had met to discuss naval policy; the result was the

Washington Treaties, the one fixing an agreed ratio between the fleets of the three great naval Powers, the other—subscribed to by altogether nine states—providing for non-aggression in China, together with the policy of the “open door”—or peaceful penetration of the Chinese dominions by foreign commercial establishments.

Japan honestly adhered to these agreements for nearly ten years, trusting to peaceful penetration to extend her commercial interests in China. Since the Russo-Japanese war of 1904, Japan had been left with a free hand to develop the large natural resources of Manchuria, which had been neglected by the Chinese; the South Manchurian Railway Company, originally built by Russians but transferred to Japan in 1905, became a great multiple commercial and industrial company, employing over a million Chinese and paying dividends on a capital of some £200,000,000, most of which had been raised in Japan. Chang Tso-Lin, the Governor of Manchuria, was for some years on the friendliest of terms with the Japanese and was put into financial harness by the grant of large Japanese loans. So completely did the Japanese accept the Washington agreement that they actually handed back Kiao-Chow to China in 1922. The Peking Government of the time, however, was not content with this windfall; they proceeded to ask for the return of Port Arthur, which the Japanese had taken, not from the Germans during the Great War, but from the Russians in 1904. Japan definitely refused to consider this cession, and another boycott of Japanese goods was begun in northern China. In 1925 there were riots in the port of Shanghai originating in the killing of a Chinese by a Japanese in a brawl; foreigners in general were assaulted, and joint action was taken by the British, the Americans and the Japanese to protect their subjects. Yet Japan took no further action, and even held back when British and American troops attacked the Chinese forces at Canton. Again in 1927, when foreigners were murdered in Nanking, Japan showed the least inclination for aggression, though British and American warships fired on the rioters.

Meanwhile Japanese economic progress in Manchuria was being threatened by the development of opposition from Chang Tso-Lin. Failing to obtain Japanese support for his campaigns in the Chinese civil war, Chang deliberately started a new railway parallel to the Japanese line in order to cut into its profits. There

was a strong reaction in Japan, and a change of Government led to the despatch of a Japanese force to the Shantung peninsula to protect Japanese interests against aggressions by the victorious armies of the Kuo Min Tang. During the course of 1928 the Japanese forces came to blows with the troops of Chiang Kai-Shek, but with the restoration of peace in the peninsula the Japanese troops were withdrawn in 1929.

The assassination of Chang of Manchuria in 1928 did not end the friction in the north. His son Chang Hsueh-Liang intensified the campaign against the Japanese; he stopped the interest on the loans raised by old Chang and he took no effective steps to check a series of murderous raids on the houses of Japanese subjects in Manchuria. The Japanese accused him of deliberately organising these raids; the Manchurians in turn accused the Japanese of murdering the late Governor. In 1930 a petition, similar to that of the Uitlanders before the South African War, was sent by the settlers in Manchuria to Tokio asking for protection. A year later the Japanese army leaders, without consulting the Government at Tokio, ordered an advance from Port Arthur and Korea into Manchuria to avenge a particularly atrocious bomb-outrage on the South Manchurian Railway. The feeble Chinese garrisons put up practically no opposition, and the Japanese troops occupied Mukden, Kirin, Harbin and Tsitsihar. China appealed to the League of Nations, which ordered the Japanese to withdraw their armed forces from Manchuria. Japan agreed to restrict the area of occupation, but refused to abandon the key-points of Mukden and Kirin.

Young Chang established his headquarters at Chin Chow in the south-west corner of Manchuria, and a guerilla war against the invaders began. In 1932 the Japanese took a decisive step; they proclaimed the separation of Manchuria from China and its erection into an independent state under the name of Manchu Kuo. The former Chinese Emperor Pu Yi was persuaded to accept the "dictatorship"; he became "Emperor" of Manchu Kuo in 1934. The actual government of the new state was carried on by Japanese soldiers and officials. China was in no position to drive out the splendidly equipped and highly trained army of a first-class Power. She could only appeal to the League of Nations again; the League delayed further action until it had sent out a Commission—headed by Lord Lytton—to investigate conditions

on the spot. The Commission reported that Japan was entirely in the wrong, and the League approved its report in 1933. Japan promptly resigned from the League of Nations which, while refusing to recognise either the occupation or the new state of Manchu Kuo, took no steps to impose sanctions on the Power which had violated both the Covenant of the League and the Washington agreement—not to mention the Kellogg pact to outlaw war. The only check to Japanese aggression was when a force of some 12,000 Japanese landed at Shanghai and, using the international Concession—a miniature republic under the control of a local council of foreign residents—as a base of operations, attacked the nearest Chinese troops in revenge for anti-Japanese rioting in the native city. Fighting behind carefully prepared trenches, the Chinese troops repulsed the enemy attack, and the protests of the Powers were so strong that Japan thought it wiser to withdraw the expedition.

In 1933, Japanese troops invaded the district of Jehol, between Manchuria and Peking. The Chinese army was no match in the open field for a large Japanese force, and the attempted resistance soon collapsed. An armistice was signed, which left the Great Wall of China the boundary between the two armies, a demilitarised zone being arranged to avoid the occurrence of "incidents". Affairs were left in this insecure and temporary condition, for the Government of Chiang Kai-Shek could not bring itself to negotiate any peace which would hand over extensive Chinese provinces to her neighbour. Throughout the succeeding period a boycott of Japanese goods continued, anti-Japanese demonstrations took place in the big Chinese cities, and in 1935 the Foreign Minister was shot during a Kuo Min Tang meeting for his failure to resist the Japanese demands. During that year the uneasy truce seemed nearing an end when Japan demanded the closing of all Kuo Min Tang clubs in the demilitarised zone, together with an extension of that zone westwards; the Chinese Government avoided a resumption of hostilities by giving way. Meanwhile the Japanese fomented a demand for "home rule" in the north of China, just as the French had done in the Rhineland during the days following the Treaty of Versailles. An autonomous state was actually declared in Hopei by a man named Yin Ju-Keng in 1935, whilst a second autonomous state was declared in Chahar, to the north of the Chinese Wall, by a certain Sung Cheh-Yuan.

It looked as though several more Manchu Kuos were about to be created.

The demilitarised zone soon ceased to fulfil its purpose after the establishment of the autonomous states in the Peking area. The Councils of Hopei and Chahar, federating into a single unit, were persuaded to allow Japanese troops to take up positions round the old Chinese capital to overawe the local representatives of the Kuo Min Tang, whom the Japanese accused of arming for an attack on them. Chinese troops from Nanking were promptly sent into the occupied area, and for some months the two armies watched each other. There was still a state of peace, but it was obvious that at any moment an "incident" might plunge the north into warfare. Such an incident occurred in the summer of 1937, when Japanese and Chinese troops began to fire on each other at Liu Kow Chow, a few miles from Peking. Within a week full war conditions had developed, though there was no formal declaration of war on either side. China appealed to the League of Nations, as she had done in 1931, and the League subsequently declared Japan an aggressor. The Japanese entered Peking, after some severe fighting, and then swept southwards and westwards. The main forces, advancing in three columns, drove the Chinese back towards the Hwang Ho, whilst another army overran Sin Kiang. Meanwhile, to hold the Kuo Min Tang forces to the south, a Japanese force was landed a few miles from Shanghai, as in 1932, and gained a foothold between that city and the mouth of the Yang-Tse Kiang. Nanking and Canton were exposed to destructive air-raids, which entailed great loss of life. Under the auspices of the League of Nations, a meeting of the signatories of the twelve-power treaty of 1922 was summoned; meanwhile Japan continued to absorb several more Chinese provinces.

Before the development of Japanese aggression in Manchuria, the old Russian danger loomed large in the eyes of the rulers of China. For some time Russia was distracted by civil wars that were even more destructive than those of China, but with the unification of the Russian Empire under Bolshevik control the northern peril returned, particularly as the Moscow Communists were bent on forming a Communist party in China itself. Apart from the interference of the Comintern with Chinese politics, the trouble was likely to begin in Mongolia, the outer parts of

which had enjoyed autonomy since 1913. In 1919 the Chinese protectorate over outer Mongolia was defined by treaty with the local Government. During the Russian civil war in Siberia both "Reds" and "Whites" ignored the Mongolian frontier, raiding the country for supplies and trying to enlist adherents to their armed forces. A party of "Whites" having established themselves at Urga, the Communist forces invaded Mongolia in 1921. The Peking Government entrusted the task of expelling the Russians to Chang Tso-Lin of Manchuria; he took the money paid him for the expedition, but sent not a man to Mongolia. Diplomatic relations with Russia were not established until 1924, but Bolshevik agents continued to stir up trouble in various parts of China, even helping movements that were far from Communist in aim, such as Chang's bid for power in 1924. In 1929 a number of Russians were arrested by young Chang at Harbin, but on a threat of war the Chinese Government secured their release. Northern Mongolia was meanwhile falling completely under Soviet influence, and the new state of Tannou-Touva became practically a protectorate of Russia. In 1936 the Mongolians made a number of unauthorised raids over the Chinese frontier, but were expelled after some fighting by the forces of Chiang Kai-Shek.

The other Powers adopted in post-war years a far more friendly attitude towards China than in previous periods. The Powers had extorted from China at various dates a whole series of special concessions. They were guaranteed trading rights; an international controller supervised the collection of the customs duties and other taxes in order to secure the interest on foreign loans; there were separate foreign post-offices running their own mails in the larger coast-towns; there were foreign-ruled ports at various places round the coast—the British possessions of Hong Kong and Wei Hai Wei, the French possession of Kwang Chow, the Japanese possessions of Port Arthur and Kiao Chow, and the international settlement at Shanghai. At the Washington Conference of 1921 the policy of the "open door" was emphasised and further territorial acquisitions condemned, whilst the foreign post-offices were closed down in 1922.¹ Japan restored Kiao-Chow to China in 1922 and Great Britain gave back Wei Hai Wei in 1930. In the latter year China was also guaranteed control of her own customs-collection, even Japan joining in the agree-

¹ The French post-office at Kwang Chow was excepted

ment. An outstanding controversy of long duration over the amount due to France under the old "Boxer war" indemnity of 1900 was settled by treaty in 1925.

Such trouble as arose between the western Powers and China was due mainly to the repercussions of the Japanese struggle. In the Shanghai riots that followed the killing of a Chinese by a Japanese in 1925 foreigners of all nations were exposed to attack, and as a result British and American cruisers convoyed troops to the city and there was some fighting; there was also fighting at Canton, where a Franco-British expedition had gone to protect the foreign element. The responsibility for the Shanghai outbreak was the subject of a long controversy. The local diplomats put the blame on the foreign element in the city; a joint commission set up by Britain, Japan and America failed to agree, the British and Japanese members blaming the Chinese and the Americans blaming the foreigners. That the American conclusion was right seemed likely from the action of the international council that ruled the foreign settlements at Shanghai; compensation was paid to the Chinese Government and certain foreign officials were dismissed. As an anti-climax to the affair, China returned the compensation money on the grounds that it was inadequate. Britain did not come very creditably out of this affair, for her representatives had used their influence to suppress the report of the diplomats who had condemned the foreigners, and for a year or two relations between China and Great Britain were extremely strained. The trade of Hong Kong was boycotted, Chinese labourers left the port by the thousand, and there was some anti-British violence, leading to a bombardment of Wan-Hsien by British cruisers in 1926. When the Kuo Min Tang army entered Nanking in 1927 there were murders of foreigners, leading to more diplomatic intervention. The Japanese aggression in Manchuria diverted Chinese attention to the north, and after the other Powers had dissociated themselves from Japanese action both in Manchuria and at Shanghai relations with the western powers improved.

China under the Republic presented a spectacle somewhat resembling a huge tenement-house in which numerous families pursued their own activities without any regard to what the other tenants were doing. The civil war of the Tuchuns forms one movement; alongside of this were the Nationalist and Communist

movements; there was the conflict with Japan; with the international relations between China and the western Powers conducted almost as a separate department of foreign policy. Relations with the Mongolians and with the inhabitants of Turkestan seem to fall into equally isolated compartments. A Ministry of Finance negotiates currency policy with foreign banking establishments, and China abandons the silver standard for currency-notes in 1935; the British financial expert Sir Arthur Salter arrives to advise the Ministry in 1931. Behind all the international complications and internal strife are the scores of millions of humble Chinese families, painfully amassing their tiny fortunes out of small holdings cultivated by the most primitive methods or toiling in the factories of the big cities under conditions of appalling industrial slavery. In 1931 the Yang Tse overflowed its banks, and an area the size of Scotland became a lake; ten million people were rendered destitute. Two years later there were similar floods on the Hwang Ho; two thousand villages were destroyed. When the floods had abated the peasants returned to start their little family enterprises all over again. The tenants on the other floors and the shopkeepers and soldiers who occupy other portions of the great tenement-house care nothing for all this. China is a country without a genuine national life.

JAPAN

About the time of the Great War, the Japanese were often referred to in Europe as "the Germans of the Far East". There was, indeed, a certain similarity between pre-war Germany and post-war Japan. In both countries an active Government planned and legislated for national development both military and industrial. In both countries the old military traditions had been preserved by a strong army caste. In both countries a democratic parliament was overshadowed by the prerogative power of the imperial monarch. The most pressing problem of Japan, however, resembled that of post-war rather than pre-war Germany; her economic resources were insufficient for a teeming population, and in a period when protectionist policies were sweeping even those countries that had been champions of Free Trade the attempt to maintain an adequate supply of food and raw materials by exchanging them for manufactured exports became increas-

ingly difficult. This economic factor lay behind the wave of militarist expansion that drove Japan into the Manchurian adventure.

Japan emerged from the Great War on the top of a wave of prosperity. She had taken little military part in the war beyond the reduction of the German port of Tsing Tao in China, but she had sold, for hard cash, vast quantities of munitions and supplies to the Allies, and her export trade had increased by leaps and bounds. The Treaty of Versailles awarded her the German port that she had captured, whilst the collapse of Russia—her old enemy—in a welter of civil war opened up prospects of enlarging still further her sphere of influence in eastern Asia. She had supplied a large contingent for the Allies' attack on Bolshevism, and her troops were in occupation of Vladivostok and the island of Sakhalin. If Russia's collapse became total it seemed likely that Japan would retain her hold on these occupied areas.

Russia, however, did not collapse, and in a couple of years the rule of Moscow was enforced over the whole of Siberia. The re-crudescence of Russian power and the lapse of the British treaty of alliance, coupled with the strong hostility of the United States, caused the Japanese Government to withdraw from its projects of expansion, and at the Washington Conference of 1921 she agreed to evacuate Vladivostok, to accept the "open door" policy in China, to limit her naval armaments to a ratio of three-fifths of the American total of capital ships, and to sign an amicable treaty with Britain, America and France for the adjustment of claims in the Pacific area. In 1922, as a token of acceptance of the new peaceful policy, Japan handed back Kiao-Chow to China. The question of Japanese rights in the island of Sakhalin remained unsettled for some time longer, but in 1925 a treaty with Russia restored the northern part of the island to Russian control.

For ten years after the Washington conference Japan followed a policy of peaceful development. The democracy of her parliamentary system was further extended by a lowering of the property qualification for electors in 1919, and in 1925 manhood suffrage at the age of twenty-five was introduced, adding some ten millions to the electorate. The latter measure was, however, accompanied by a stringent Treason Act to safeguard the traditional principle of royal control; any person attempting to weaken the authority of the Emperor was made liable to a

penalty of ten years' imprisonment. Three years later, as a result of Communist agitation, the death penalty was introduced for offences under this Act.

Parliamentary politics were dominated by the two-party system, the Seiyukai representing the Conservative party and the Minseito—also called the Kenseikai—representing the Liberals. Japanese politics, however, were largely a matter of group, family and personal intrigue, whilst the influence of the higher nobility—the “Elder Statesmen”—and the military and naval chiefs with the Emperor was often sufficient to outweigh that of the parliamentary Cabinet. It was noteworthy that the defence departments lay outside the control of the Cabinet, and so important a departure in foreign policy as the invasion of Manchuria in 1931 was undertaken by the war departments without the sanction or knowledge of the Ministry as a whole. The Seiyukai Conservatives held office at the end of the war, the then Prime Minister, Hara, being the first commoner to hold that office. The Liberal Minseito won the election of 1924, and entered upon a period of office which lasted till 1931, and at the 1932 election the Seiyukai returned with a two to one majority on the Manchurian war question, the Liberals having shown considerable reluctance to abandon the peaceful policy of the past decade. The Emperor Yoshihito died in 1926, and his son Hirohito, aged twenty-five, succeeded him.

The period of peaceful development saw some attempts to improve labour conditions in Japan, a factory act being passed in 1926 to prohibit the employment of children under fourteen and to exclude women and all persons under sixteen from night-work: many exceptions were introduced even to these provisions, and Japanese labour conditions remained bad in comparison with those of western countries, though far superior to those of Chinese industry. A bill to recognise Trade Unions passed the lower House but was rejected by the House of Lords in 1931. Two separate Labour parties contested parliamentary elections, but it was not until after the adoption of manhood suffrage in 1925 that they had any chance of winning seats. Five Labour members sat in the Parliament elected in 1930, and—after the amalgamation of the two Labour parties—twenty-six seats were won by Labour in 1936. The Communists were anti-parliamentary and obtained much support from the subject population of Korea, which had

for long been agitating for independence. In 1928, eighty-four Korean Communists were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, and in the same year a thousand Communists were arrested in Japan itself. In 1931 there were some Communist disturbances, notably an attempt to fire a jail where members of the party were incarcerated, and in the following year nearly a hundred sentences were inflicted upon this group of agitators. In 1932 a Korean threw a bomb at the Emperor.

Assassination was a frequent feature of Japanese politics. In 1921 Hara, the premier, was murdered by a revolutionary fanatic; in 1924 a student was executed after attempting the life of the Prince Regent; in 1931 another Prime Minister, Hamaguchi, retired from office to die from the effect of a wound administered by an assassin; a plot to murder Admiral Saito just after his acceptance of the premiership in 1932 was frustrated before it could take effect. Nor were parliamentary discussions altogether free from disturbances; though there was no actual shooting, there were plenty of riotous scenes during the debates of 1927 and 1929, and on one occasion the House dissolved in a free fight. Another unpleasant feature of Japanese political life, as in that of numerous other countries, was the corruption which prevailed in so many quarters. In 1924 there were serious scandals connected with the activities in Manchuria and Siberia, and in 1928 half the municipal councillors of Tokio went to jail for corruption. A trustworthy council for that city was never more needed than during the years following 1923, when a great earthquake, followed by a tidal wave, destroyed a quarter of a million houses in Tokio and blotted out the great seaport of Yokohama. The death-roll exceeded 100,000, and the two cities had to be almost entirely reconstructed.

The abandonment of the policy of peace and non-aggression was due to the results of the economic crisis of 1931, which hit Japan a severe blow. Exports fell off and unemployment increased. Some of the consequent discontent found expression in Communist agitation; the army leaders, who had always chafed at the inactivity to which they had been condemned, took advantage of the situation to advise a forward policy in China. In 1931, without consulting the Cabinet as a whole, the war departments initiated a military advance in Manchuria, to avenge a bomb outrage on the Japanese-owned South Manchurian Railway.

The Minseito Government resigned and at the general election of 1932 a Seiyukai majority was returned, willing to support the action of the militarists in Manchuria. Even the Conservative party, however, was not prepared to become a pawn in the hands of the army leaders, and some severe criticism was levelled at the course pursued by the military authorities in Manchuria. As a result of this criticism, a group of army officers assassinated the Conservative Prime Minister, Inukai, and attempted to assassinate the Minister of War, who escaped. The premiership was then taken by Viscount Saito, an Admiral, and the succeeding months saw the erection of the new state of Manchu Kuo, under Japanese protection.

The military chiefs continued to direct policy in China without reference to Cabinet or Parliament. When opposition manifested itself too strongly resort was had to assassination. In 1935, General Nagata, a War Office official, was murdered by an officer, for outspoken criticism. The "defence" forces were now costing the state close on half its annual expenditure. In 1936 a fresh general election returned the Minseito with a small majority. Okada, another Admiral, took over the premiership, Viscount Saito accepting office under him. Soon after the election a number of officers collected 1500 troops and attempted a *coup d'état*. The rebels seized the Houses of Parliament and invaded the residences of the Cabinet, murdering Viscount Saito and two other Ministers. The premier escaped, while another Minister was wounded. The Government, however, rallied the rest of the Tokio garrison to its support, and the rebels were soon on the defensive. Some of the leaders of the revolt committed suicide; the rest surrendered; seventeen rebels were executed, along with the murderer of General Nagata, arrested in the previous year. In spite of this apparent victory of the parliamentary Government, the premier resigned, his place being taken by the former Foreign Minister, Hirota, whilst the War Office was entrusted to General Terauchi, who was known as a militarist firebrand. It was obvious, however, that these concessions to the army were represented by the Cabinet as a whole, and there were indications that the Minseito, supported by "big business" interests, were prepared to check the extreme demands of the war-party.

Meanwhile army and Cabinet were united at least on one point—the need to combat Communism. The prisons were packed

with Communists, and across the water in Korea, twenty-two were executed, after a spectacular trial of 245 prisoners. The extreme limit of Conservative reaction was reached in 1935, when the works of Dr Minobe, which had been the standard text-books of constitutional law in Japan for a generation, were banned as disrespectful to the Emperor. In 1936 a treaty with Germany arranged for mutual assistance in the "fight against Bolshevism".

Relations with Russia naturally grew more strained with the aggressions in Manchuria and the persecution of Communists in Japan. Taking advantage of Russia's absorption in the great economic Plans, Japan extorted an agreement by which Russia sold her interests in the northern railways of Manchuria; in 1932 troops were massed on the Russian frontier in readiness for further aggressions which would have brought Mongolia within the Japanese sphere of influence. Russia, however, now showed a firm front; Communist levies were hurried to the far east, and Japan, having already sufficient work to do in the direction of Peking, adopted a less hostile attitude to the Soviet state. Constant frontier incidents kept ill-feeling alive, and Moscow proceeded to build up a permanent military base on the edge of Manchu Kuo. In 1937 a dispute over the ownership of a small island in the Amur river led to exchange of shots between Russians and Japanese, and diplomatic tension increased.

The helplessness of the Chinese military forces encouraged still further aggressions. Japan proceeded to swallow northern China—to use a historic simile—"leaf by leaf, like an artichoke". First Jehol was occupied, then Chahar, and then Hopei, autonomous administrations being set up in the two latter districts. Although Japan had agreed in 1933 to keep her troops to the north of the Great Wall of China, these successive aggressions were accompanied by advances of troops. In 1937 a Japanese detachment which had penetrated beyond Peking came into conflict with a Chinese force, and preparations were made for another sweep forward which would place northern China completely in the grip of the invaders.

The future of Japan depended mainly on the continued abstention of the Great Powers from interfering with her plans in China. The League of Nations uttered an ineffective protest against the invasion of Manchuria, but did nothing to impose sanctions. Japan resigned from the League and went her own

way. The Japanese successes had hitherto been obtained against forces that were badly equipped, badly trained, and badly disciplined. Even the victories of the Russo-Japanese war in 1904 had been won over an enemy that was almost isolated from its national bases, for the single-track Siberian railway was a totally inadequate line of communication between European Russia and the Far East, though the naval victory of Tsu Shima redounded greatly to the credit of the Japanese fleet. The Russian defence of the Manchurian border is now far more thoroughly and scientifically organised than was the case in 1904, whilst the Siberian railway has been double-tracked and provided with intermediate military depots. The United States, too, though far from friendly towards Moscow, is not likely to carry its neutrality towards Japan to unlimited lengths, and though Germany, if strong enough, can be relied upon to help Japan in a war against Russia, there is now no British alliance to "keep the ring" if America or any other Power should weight the balance against Japan. Since 1924 the United States has maintained a ban on all Japanese immigration, and the refusal of the Japanese at the Naval Conference of 1936 to accept the Washington ratio of fleets has increased the hostility of Americans. Even against the Chinese the Japanese troops have not always been victorious, at Shanghai in 1932 Chinese troops, entrenched on a peninsula in a position that could not be outflanked, defeated their opponents. Japanese military and naval expenditure seems to have already reached the limit of the country's economic strength, and it is doubtful if the financial burden of a war with a Great Power could be borne for very long. When, in addition to these considerations, it is borne in mind that world opinion as a whole is strongly hostile to Japan, it must be conceded that the future of her forward policy is not without serious dangers.

EGYPT

After the British had punished Arabi Pasha for his massacre of Europeans in 1882, they remained in "temporary" occupation of Egypt. In 1914 they were still in "temporary occupation" of the country, which was for all practical purposes treated as part of the British Empire. The Egyptians had for generations maintained the pious fiction that their rulers, the Khedives, were

merely deputies for the Sultan of Turkey, and this fiction was supplemented by another one after 1882, that the British were nominally the deputies of the Khedives. When Turkey entered the Great War as ally of the Central Powers, the excuse was given to terminate at least one of these fictions; the Sultan's rule was declared at an end and the Khedive was replaced by a descendant of Mehemet Ali who was given the title of Sultan of Egypt, whilst a formal British Protectorate was at the same time decreed.

The advocacy of self-determination for subject peoples by President Wilson encouraged the Egyptian leaders to hope for independence when the Turkish Empire was shattered by the Allied forces, but at the conference of Paris it soon became apparent that Egypt was to be left outside the scope even of the mandated territories and that the British control would continue. A serious outburst of discontent followed. Feeling was exacerbated by the fact that the Arabs were allowed a deputation to Paris whilst the Egyptians were kept out, and by memories of the autocratic action of the British military authorities during the war, when crops and even labour were commandeered at an arbitrary figure. It was not long before a political party was formed to agitate for independence, but whilst the Paris Conference was in session the leaders of this Independence party—the *Wafd*—were arrested and deported. The party proceeded to organise a series of acts of violence, mainly directed towards interrupting communications by interference with railway lines and telegraph wires. There were also some riots, in which a few British settlers lost their lives. General Allenby, who had commanded the British force in Egypt during the war, was sent back to restore order, whilst Lord Milner headed a Commission of enquiry which went out to Egypt at the end of 1919. Whilst taking steps to restore order, Allenby and Milner adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the Egyptian Nationalists. The exiled leaders of the *Wafd* were released and negotiations were opened with them. The chief organiser of the party, Zaghloul Pasha, went to London and took part in lengthy discussions with the British Government.

Britain had effected vast improvements in the condition of Egypt, which had increased in population from seven to thirteen millions during the long period of the military occupation, and had invested large sums of money in the country; the Govern-

ment felt that it would be unwise to entrust the fortunes of British enterprise in the country to the unskilled political control of the natives, of whom very few were educated. It was also regarded as essential that the route to India and the East should be secured to British control by the maintenance of military garrisons along the Suez canal, whilst complete British dominance in the Sudan, which had been subdued by Kitchener's army in 1898, was another point on which the Government would make no serious concession. With these reservations of the Suez canal, the right to protect foreign and minority interests, and the control of the Sudan, Britain offered to agree to Egyptian independence, adding a proviso that no other foreign state should be allowed special interests in Egypt. Zaghloul was for unconditional independence, including Egyptian control of the Sudan hinterland, and was particularly incensed against the proposal to establish British officials to supervise Egyptian finances and the administration of justice. In 1921 a split occurred among the delegates in London; Zaghloul abandoned the hope of peaceful settlement and returned home to renew the violent agitation, whilst the rest of the Egyptian representatives remained in London to continue negotiations. The general feeling among most educated Egyptians was at this time strongly in favour of compromise, and the Legislative Assembly at Cairo—a consultative body chosen by indirect election and established since 1913—disavowed the actions of Zaghloul. Meanwhile serious riots had taken place in Cairo and Alexandria, and some Europeans were murdered. When Zaghloul issued an open appeal to force he was arrested, and at the end of 1921 he was deported to Ceylon along with five other Wafd leaders. A riot in Cairo following his departure was soon put down and a fair measure of order was restored.

After Zaghloul's departure the negotiations proceeded more easily, though the British insistence on the right to send troops outside the immediate canal-zone and the power of veto on treaties between Egypt and other states caused much friction. It was not until 1923 that the Legislative Assembly at Cairo agreed to the British terms, including the "reserved points". In the previous year, Fuad, the Sultan who had succeeded his brother Hussein in 1917, had been proclaimed "King" of Egypt, and the country was recognised as an "independent" state. The agreement of 1923 was not complete, for the knotty question of the Sudan

was left over for future settlement. The agreement was accompanied by a new Constitution providing for the election of an Egyptian Parliament. The passage of the agreement through the Legislative Assembly was accompanied by some disorder in the larger towns; in 1922 five British were murdered and two of the Egyptian Moderates were also assassinated, whilst in the following year there was some bomb-throwing. The conclusion of the agreement was, however, accompanied by a general amnesty, and Zaghloul was released from his exile and given full freedom to take part in the coming elections. Martial law, which had existed in Egypt since 1914, was at the same time withdrawn.

The Egyptian general election held at the end of 1923 resulted in the return of a huge Wafd majority. Zaghloul Pasha, who was shot at and wounded by a student just after the elections, found himself in the position of Prime Minister of Egypt, with 176 members out of 214 supporting him. The new Parliament at once set itself to overthrow the "reservations" of the recent agreement. The advent to office of a Labour Government at Westminster encouraged the Wafd to believe that a more generous measure of concession was coming, and Zaghloul demanded that the British troops should evacuate Egypt. At the same time the Egyptian detachments of troops under British command in the Sudan mutinied at Atbara and Port Sudan. The Labour Government, however, showed considerable hesitation in granting further concessions, and after the assassination of Sir Lee Stack, Governor of the Sudan and still Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian army, the Government's attitude hardened. Lord Allenby, who as High Commissioner represented the British Government in Egypt, presented an ultimatum demanding the punishment of the murderers of Stack and the payment of an indemnity of half a million, the withdrawal of all Egyptian troops from the Sudan, and a restriction of political meetings in Egypt. Zaghloul accepted all these points except the evacuation of the Sudan. Allenby then expelled the Egyptian regiments from that area and seized control of the collection of customs-duties in the port of Alexandria. Zaghloul then resigned office, and his successor as premier, Ahmad Pasha, accepted the full terms of the ultimatum. Parliament registered a protest with the League of Nations against the British action. The Egyptian troops returning from the Sudan mutinied again, and three British soldiers were

murdered. The British Government then put pressure on King Fuad to dissolve Parliament and hold another election.

Though the Wafd failed to secure an absolute majority in the 1925 elections, Zaghloul was elected Chairman of the House, and it was evident that the extremists would dominate the assembly. Parliament was almost immediately dissolved and no election was held until 1926. The Wafd members continued to meet in session at a Cairo hotel, and made preparations for securing a majority in the next Parliament. Hoping to modify the influence of the extremists, the Government of King Fuad—which throughout maintained the moderate attitude—substituted direct for indirect election, but the only result was to give the Wafd 164 seats out of 214, whilst only fourteen members of the Government party secured election. Zaghloul now showed a more compromising spirit; he agreed to abstain from candidature for the premiership, and a Government was formed which, though Wafd in spirit, was only indirectly led by Zaghloul. There was no revival of violent methods, and the murderers of Sir Lee Stack were sent to trial. Out of the seven accused—who included two of Zaghloul's former Ministers—only one, an insignificant person, was found guilty. The Court was composed of several judges, including a British one; he resigned in protest at what he declared was the gross partiality of the proceedings. Zaghloul was now a sick man, and he died in 1927. The Wafd party weakened itself by internal feuds, and was further discredited by charges of gross corruption in the Wafd Cabinet in 1928; the Prime Minister and the Chairman of the House—both practising lawyers—were accused of using their political positions to benefit the interests of persons who were their clients. The Egyptian Bar Council, however, exonerated them.

The return of Labour to office in Great Britain in 1929 encouraged the Wafd to renew the agitation for complete independence. Lord Lloyd, who had succeeded Allenby as High Commissioner in 1925, had already had friction with the Conservative Government on account of his refusal to consider further concessions; in 1929 Lloyd was recalled by the Labour Government, which now offered to restrict the British troops to the canal-zone, to abandon the British rights to protect foreign and minority interests, and to share the rule of the Sudan with the Egyptian Government. The Egyptian general election of

1929 returned another huge Wafd majority, and the British offer was challenged on the Sudanese issue. Relations between Britain and Egypt were becoming very serious again, and King Fuad decided to ally himself as before with the British Government. Nahas Pasha, the new Wafd leader, introduced a Bill in 1930 to impose penalties on any Minister who should assist in the suspension of Parliament without its own consent, but King Fuad refused his consent, dismissed the Cabinet, established his friend Sidky Pasha as Premier, and prorogued Parliament. A new Constitution was then promulgated by decree; the system of indirect election was restored, whilst the king was given the right to appoint a majority of the Senate. The age of voters was also raised from twenty-one to twenty-five.

King Fuad threw himself heartily into the task of securing a favourable majority in the Parliament elected under this new system in 1931. Opposition speakers were hindered by the diversion of their trains into railway sidings until the meetings to which they were going had taken place. There were fierce riots during the elections, but the King's Government dealt with these in severe fashion, without the British being called upon to help in the restoration of order. The Wafd eventually decided to boycott the elections, and under these circumstances the King's party secured 127 seats out of 150; some two-thirds of the electorate voted. Sidky Pasha remained Prime Minister, wielding a virtual dictatorship on behalf of King Fuad. Even the new Parliament was not allowed to share in the government; the Constitution was continually "suspended". The dictatorship lasted from 1931 to 1936, there being occasional riots, arrests of Wafd leaders, and bomb outrages.

The dictatorship was justified by its supporters partly on account of the great economic crisis, which hit Egypt very hard. The production of cotton, which had brought in large profits in the years following the war, became actually unprofitable. Nahas Pasha had tried to relieve the cotton-growers by buying up for the Government at a figure that would at least prevent losses, but the stock so accumulated at last became so large that its release on the market would depress prices still further. Meanwhile the Government was faced with the expense of storage and insurance. It was some years before this stock was cleared; meanwhile many cotton-growers had given their land over to

wheat instead of cotton, and the situation slowly righted itself. The Nationalist agitation absorbed almost the whole interest of the Egyptian people during these years. There was a small Communist party in Egypt, and in 1924 there had been a seizure of factories by Communist workmen in Alexandria, but the influence of this movement was very slight and was confined mainly to the foreign element. The 1924 disturbances were followed by some arrests and deportations. There was a long dispute with Ibn Saud of Arabia over the treatment of pilgrims going to Mecca; this was settled by treaty in 1936 after ten years' interruption of the Egyptian participation in the pilgrimage. King Fuad had strengthened his claims to the throne by obtaining a renunciation of the throne from Abbas Hilmy, the Khedive deposed in 1914, in exchange for a pension. On King Fuad's death in 1936 he was succeeded by his son Farouk, who at the time was at school in England.

Early in the year 1936 a general election was held and the sessions of Parliament were allowed to reopen. The Wafd obtained its former huge majority, and Nahas Pasha resumed office as Prime Minister. The resumption of constitutional government was accompanied by another effort on the part of the British Government to obtain a peaceful agreement with the Egyptians. After long negotiations there was signed before the end of the year a treaty which restricted British rights to the military occupation of the canal-zone—along with the right to use Egyptian ports and aerodromes for military purposes—and arranged for a joint rule over the Sudan, the Egyptian troops being allowed to return to that country. Egypt also guaranteed an alliance with Britain in the event of a war. The British interests in the Sudan were still regarded as of paramount importance, for, whilst slavery had been at last stamped out throughout the province, many of the tribes were extremely backward and rebellious; there had been risings among the Dinkas in 1919 and at Darfur in 1921, the rebels being in each case defeated by British troops.

The signing of the 1936 treaty was celebrated by great rejoicings among the Egyptians. It still fell short of Zaghloul's original aims for the Wafd party. The first action of the party after the signature of the treaty was to cancel all the enactments of the Sidky regime as unconstitutional. This was followed by a wholesale clearance of supporters of the previous Government

from the civil service and their replacement by supporters of the Wafd. Hitherto the Nationalist party has been kept fairly closely united in opposition to the alien British influence. It remains to be seen whether the treaty settlement of 1936 will be accepted by the party as at least temporarily binding, and whether the development of political strife among the Egyptians will follow constitutional or revolutionary lines.

MOROCCO

Morocco is divided into three parts; France exercises a protectorate over the Sultan of Morocco, and thereby claims authority over the major portion of the country and a population of some six millions, Spain claims the Mediterranean coast, with somewhat less than a million inhabitants, whilst the town of Tangier, with some 50,000 inhabitants, is under the international control of a joint committee of European Powers.

By the time of the Treaty of Versailles, French rule did not extend over much more than half the area nominally included in the Sultanate of Morocco. Under the energetic governorship of Marshal Lyautey, however, European influence was brought to bear on the distant tribes of the east, though not before a series of military campaigns had been undertaken. By 1923 the lands lying west of the Atlas mountains had been reduced to complete submission, and in that year a small army was sent into the mountains to secure the submission of the hitherto independent tribes. The process of conquest was interrupted, and in a sense aided, by the incursion of bodies of Riffs from the Spanish Zone, as a result of the protracted war in that area, and it was the French army that eventually secured the defeat and surrender of Abd el Krim, who crossed the French Zone frontier in 1925. The French brought 160,000 men—mainly native Moors—against him, co-operating with the Spanish force of 75,000, and in 1926 the Riffs surrendered, Abd el Krim being sent to exile in the island of Réunion. In 1931 a drive was begun on the eastern side of the Atlas, and in the following year the oasis of Tafilat was occupied; a final expedition to the far south-west along the Wadi Dra completed the conquest in 1934.

The French administration was generally efficient; new roads were built, order was maintained, and the ports received a great

trading impetus. In 1921 a great market was opened in Mequinez, and next year the port of Agadir was opened to trade after having been closed since 1764, when its trade was arbitrarily stopped by a local chieftain to punish a rebellion and to promote the trade of the rival port of Mogador. It cannot be said, however, that the rule of the French was popular. The Sultan was despised by the Moors as a mere puppet of the French, and in 1934 there were great nationalist demonstrations in Fez. Agitation simmered until 1937, when the diversion of a polluted stream in Mequinez by the French sanitary authorities was the signal for a riot; arrests of the ringleaders were followed by a wholesale rising in the town, and it was not until troops opened fire that order was restored. Within a few days further rioting broke out at Rabat, where assaults were made on both Frenchmen and Jews; the police restored order here. It looked as though France was faced with another Syria in Morocco.

The Spaniards had never seriously occupied more than a portion of even the coastland of their sphere of influence when the great Riff rebellion broke out in 1921. Hitherto the chief trouble in that area had come from the famous mountain chief Raisuli, who was now to be overshadowed by the powerful warrior Abd el Krim. When a Spanish expedition marched against him, the Moorish regiments in the pay of the Spaniards suddenly mutinied, the European force was surrounded at Anual, and a great disaster followed, the Spaniards losing 15,000 men, 400 machine-guns and 130 pieces of artillery. General Berenguer went to Melilla with 100,000 troops to avenge this disaster, and before the end of the year he had driven the Riffs from the Gourougou Hills overlooking the town and advanced to the river Kert, where the enemy held a strong position. Here progress was held up for months, though in 1922 Anual was recaptured. Berenguer resigned, and in 1923 a civilian High Commissioner was appointed with instructions to try and secure submission by concessions. The captives of the Anual disaster were ransomed for £160,000, and Raisuli—now bitterly jealous of Abd el Krim—made his submission to the Spaniards. A native was appointed Governor of the Riff Province. All this, however, had no effect on the core of the rebellion, for Abd el Krim was merely encouraged to believe that the Spaniards had exhausted their military powers. In 1924 the Spanish army was withdrawn

to its bases at Melilla and Tetuan, after a vain attempt to hold the inland town of Sheshuan; this town was besieged by the Riffs, then relieved, and finally evacuated by European troops.

For a twelvemonth the war was at a standstill, whilst Abd el Krim had his revenge on Raisuli, whom he defeated and captured. Then some of the Riffs crossed into the French zone, and this brought Marshal Lyautey into the picture. In co-operation with the Spaniards, Lyautey began a brisk offensive among the mountains, and in 1926—after the Riff chiefs had weakened their position by violent quarrels among themselves and after typhus had broken out among the tribesmen—Abd el Krim surrendered to the French. With the departure of Abd el Krim to Réunion the Riff resistance speedily collapsed, and by the end of 1927 the last embers of the rebellion were stamped out. Since that date there has been no further native rebellion in the Spanish Zone.

Tangier, governed by a Committee of Control appointed by the Governments of France, Spain and Great Britain, was badly governed and in municipal amenities far below the standard of the French ports. In 1923 an attempt was made to reorganise the government of the town under a legislative assembly on which eleven Europeans—four French, four Spaniards, and three Britons—were to be joined by nine natives—six Mohammedans and three Jews. The native inhabitants were to be for judicial purposes under the control of a native judge, called the Mendub. There were long squabbles between the Powers over the method of selecting the native members of the assembly; France wanted them all appointed by the Mendub, who was in turn appointed by the Sultan of Morocco, who in his turn was subject to French control. This did not suit the other two Powers, and eventually a compromise was effected by which the Mendub was to choose seven and the Spanish Government two. In 1924 the Sultan appointed a Mendub, and the European Powers appointed their nominees to the assembly, but nothing else was done. After more haggling, Italy claimed a voice in the government of the town, and in 1928 an Italian representative was admitted to the controlling body. The situation in Tangier is still far from satisfactory.

CHAPTER V

America

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To the world in general, in the days preceding the Great War, the United States of America was a great territorial area in which a cosmopolitan population worked for business profits with little or no concern for the affairs of the outside world. America was the land of the "Almighty Dollar", where the race for wealth was everything. Its language was English, but full of queer corruptions, though many languages were spoken among the immigrant communities. Its constitution was republican and democratic, but politics, like everything else, were a form of money-making, and it was generally believed that corruption—known in the United States as "graft"—was universal in central and local government. "America"—for the United States often monopolises the name of the great continent—was known to be a land of big things, and the people were extremely proud of the gigantic achievements in industry and building. For so cosmopolitan a people American patriotism was always a matter of surprise to foreigners. It was known that America followed a policy of studiously avoiding political entanglements in the Old World, though of recent years she had embarked on a somewhat aggressive foreign policy in the New World, conquering the outlying colonies of Spain and interfering in Mexico and Central America, where the Panama Canal was under United States control.

It came therefore as somewhat of a surprise when the United States, after its citizens had made enormous sums of money by manufacturing supplies for both sides in the Great War, entered the field as a combatant. As long as trade with both sets of belligerents was possible, there was little talk of fighting, but as the British command of the sea tightened the blockade of Central Europe until trade with the German side was next to impossible, a situation arose in which Germany had no longer any immediate interest in keeping the United States friendly. For a moment there was a wave of resentment in America at the obnoxious

blockade which cut off one group of customers, and the situation of 1812 seemed about to repeat itself. But war with the Allies, to break the blockade of Germany, would cut off a still better group of customers, and the Allied fleets might well prove more than a match for the fleets of America and the Central Powers. America therefore concentrated its industrial efforts on selling to the Allies, and it now became the policy of Germany to hamper this trade as much as possible. The attempt to smash British power by a ruthless use of the submarine to starve the British Isles led to the sinking of numerous American trading-boats, and public opinion in America began to swing round heavily against Germany. The racial sympathies of the British portion of the American population—which was three times as great as the elements from Central Europe—also went in the same direction, and after the torpedoing of the great liner *Lusitania* America plunged rapidly into a wave of war-mindedness. In 1917 the United States openly joined the Allies, and the American delegation, headed by President Wilson, was one of the most influential sections of the Paris Conference in 1919.

For the Old World, America was President Wilson. A man of great ideals, who was not afraid to express them and advocate them in practice, Wilson came to Paris eager to ensure that the great peace settlement should go beyond a mere punishment of Germany and her allies, that the terms of the treaties should be fair enough to command lasting support from the world in general, and that the end of the Great War should be made an opportunity for the creation of a world federation which would promote the brotherhood of man and make future wars impossible. President Wilson did not have things all his own way at the peace conference, but he carried through what was to him the most important of his proposals, the establishment of the League of Nations.

President Wilson returned to America to find that the great nation in whose name he had secured the foundation of a new world-order had repudiated both him and his high ideals. War enthusiasm had soon died down in America, and though there was much pride in the achievements of the U.S.A. troops, who were credited with having won the war, it was felt that the country should take steps to avoid being drawn into any more costly and harassing European wars. The old doctrine of New

World isolation became popular once more, and the great Covenant, with its duties of collaboration and its sanctions against aggressor states, was regarded as a snare to drag America into European politics with which she was not concerned, and to introduce European influence into the New World, contrary to the "Monroe doctrine" of America for the Americans. Those who were not prepared to reject the ideal of world collaboration altogether argued against this particular League as unfair to the United States, which was to have but one vote in the Assembly against the six votes of the British Empire, and found another strong point against Wilson's scheme in the fact that it had been carried forward without the participation of the American Congress.

The Senate had always exercised a strong influence in foreign policy, and it is possible—if not probable—that had Wilson taken that body more into his confidence and allowed it to advise him in the matter of the Covenant the League idea would have been accepted in essence by the United States. Wilson's own political party, the Democrats, supported their President in the actual Covenant; the other great American party, the Republicans, were divided in opinion—a minority expressing themselves willing to accept a modified Covenant and suggesting a postponement of the League settlement until after the conclusion of peace treaties with the Central Powers. After long and somewhat acrimonious discussion, the Senate modified the Covenant by fifteen amendments or "reservations". Wilson and the Democrats, however, refused all compromise; they demanded the whole treaty or none of it, and in the final division the Democrats voted with the out-and-out opponents of the Covenant, the modified treaty being thus rejected by 51 votes to 41. The question was raised again in the next year, 1920, but once more a deadlock ensued. It was by now recognised that the League idea was dead as far as America was concerned, and separate peace treaties were signed between the United States and her former European enemies; America would not ratify the Versailles settlement because it contained the obnoxious League clauses. At the same time Wilson's tripartite treaty with Britain and France guaranteeing the Versailles frontier between France and Germany was also repudiated by the Senate. President Wilson, having already enjoyed two consecutive terms of office as the chief executive, did not stand

for the presidential election in 1920, but his support was given to the Democratic candidate Cox; the electors gave a decisive blow to the Wilsonian policy by returning 404 delegates with a mandate to vote for Harding, the Republican, as against 127 delegates for the Democrat Cox. Wilson's term of office expired in 1921, and he was succeeded by Harding, but during his last year as President his health completely collapsed, and he remained an invalid until his death in 1924.

Having wound up the last commitments of the European war and cast free of the international shackles of the Wilsonian Covenant, the United States settled down to its pursuit of the Almighty Dollar. There is no disputing the efficiency of the organisation of production in America during the ensuing decade. Old methods were improved; new methods were introduced and rapidly exploited. It was in America that mass-production, the Ford theory of skilled men at high wages, "rationalisation" of businesses, and the hire-purchase system saw either their origin or their greatest expansion. A huge and varied country, the United States could produce the greater part of the commodities her people required; an increasingly severe tariff kept out many foreign products, whilst the cheapness and efficiency of American goods enabled a great export trade to be built up. Thus America captured a great deal of the former European trade to South America, Asia and Africa, and as many foreign products were kept out of the United States by the high tariffs, payment was largely in gold, of which American banks accumulated huge quantities. It is probable that at no time in the history of the world was there so much material prosperity as in the United States during the decade following the Great War. Prices were well within the scope of wages or salaries, and working-class families were able to raise their standard of living considerably, while the men who held the big positions in business became enormously wealthy. Only in agriculture was there a failure to reap the benefit of this prosperity; consumption of agricultural products was naturally more limited than that of manufactured articles, whilst the war period had led to the raising of heavy loans by the farmers in anticipation of a continued boom which failed to materialise. With prices of agricultural produce actually falling and the burden of loan interest constant, the farmers did not share in the general increase of prosperity.

Though on the material side the United States showed the most amazing development and prosperity, there was a lack of progress on the spiritual side which was the more ugly in contrast to the splendour of mundane conditions. Just as in eighteenth-century England the polished and educated life of the drawing-rooms and the glories of military and naval victories were merely the gilt façade of social horrors and bestialities that disgust the modern Englishman, so beneath the surface of American civilisation there festered a huge mass of immorality, crime and corruption. It is disputable whether conditions were worse than in pre-war days, for America had for long possessed an unsavoury reputation for lawlessness and venality, but in some directions iniquity took on a more widespread and more horrible form. The introduction of prohibition of alcoholic drinks—against the wishes and habits of a vast mass of people—increased the volume of law-breaking, and, by bringing one law into contempt, indirectly encouraged the breaking of other laws.

The lawlessness which has been so distressing a feature of certain parts of America has been attributed to many causes. Some writers have emphasised the rough conditions of the pioneering days in the "wild west", some the influence of convict immigration to the old "plantations" before 1783, and others the general "newness" of the country. Yet eighteenth-century America, when pioneering conditions were at their hardest, was certainly more law-abiding than contemporary London, whilst the American smugglers of that age appear as honourable gentlemen compared with the monsters who haunted the coasts of Sussex. Canada and Australia are just as "new" as the United States, but they have not been distracted by quite the same type and degree of lawlessness as has developed in the latter country. Foreign critics in the older countries were apt to regard the Americans as a people so intent on the quest of the Almighty Dollar that they could spare no time for social and ethical reforms. That this impression was so general was due to the fact that stories of gangster crime provided the newspapers of other countries with more eagerly-read material than could be supplied by accounts of the widespread developments of education, music, historical research and charity which stand to the credit of the American people. The cosmopolitan nature of so many American cities formed a background for a

great deal of the criminal activity, and the generations of settlers who arrived before the immigration laws were tightened up were often of a far from desirable type.

From an administrative point of view the forces of iniquity are aided by two main factors—the division of police responsibility among the forty-eight states and the prevalence of political corruption. A unified federal police, well-trained and extending its long arm all over the Union, could do much to stamp out the numerous plague-spots of crime that flourish under the inefficient organisation of local forces. American politics have been for so long a battle of moneyed groups, with dollars as ammunition, that the wealthy gangster—a ubiquitous feature of American crime—has often enjoyed protection from the political party he fed with funds. Yet even if the police departments were separated from the political administration, there is still the danger that the evils of “graft” would exercise a baneful influence unless American reformers can raise and maintain a keener public demand for the eradication of corruption than has been witnessed in the past. The vast majority of American citizens abhor the gangsters and would fain extirpate corruption from public life, whilst the large Church communities and social reform organisations work steadily for the inculcation of higher ideals, particularly in the States of the north-east, where the Puritan tradition is still strong. That public opinion can be roused is evident from the genuine outbursts of indignation which follow the perpetration of the more heinous crimes and the exposure of political scandals; the problem is to secure that the will to effect reform shall be sustained.

Perhaps because of the seriousness and strength of the evils against which they combat, American Puritans of to-day are inclined to be more extreme than the moral reformers of other countries, and there are towns in the States which are characterised by what in Britain would be considered a narrow and old-fashioned prudery. The greatest victory of American Puritanism was the Volstead Act, the culmination of the great campaign against intoxicating liquor. Taking advantage of the wave of national idealism which followed the entry of America into the Great War, the prohibitionists carried their proposals through both Houses of Congress and then obtained the sanction of a majority of the electors in three-quarters of the separate States;

this, according to the rules of the Constitution, enabled Congress to enforce the new law upon the whole Union, for drink regulation had hitherto been a matter for each separate State. Volstead's Act, passed by Congress in 1919, "abolished" the manufacture and sale of all drinks containing more than one-half per cent of alcohol.

It was naturally anticipated that there would be widespread attempts to violate the Volstead Act, but few foresaw the gigantic organisation of illicit trading which followed. Smugglers thronged in thousands, liquor coming from across the land-frontiers and by sea. Outside the territorial limits in the Atlantic, large numbers of merchant-ships containing alcoholic liquor served the hosts of "bootleggers"—as the liquor smugglers were called. Many of them were British vessels, obtaining their supplies from Canada and the West Indies. Within the States there was plenty of manufacturing of alcoholic drinks going on, but since the whole business was illegal the produce was in a great many cases poisonously intoxicating, and the sale of this unregulated liquor had disastrous effects upon the consumers. The Federal Government made a serious attempt to enforce the law, but local effort varied with the amount of corruption, and in many towns the "speakeasy"—the illicit public-house—flourished under the eyes of the police. This vast illegal trade developed a parasitic growth in the shape of "hijackers"—men who, taking advantage of the fact that "bootleggers" could hardly prosecute them, robbed the latter of their illicit stocks as soon as they had been smuggled into the country.

It was not long before the original opponents of prohibition were reinforced by those who had become alarmed at the spread of lawlessness which the Volstead Act seemed to have caused, and at the evil social effects of the consumption of "bootleg liquor". Drunkenness among young people, many of whom regarded it as a sign of smartness to indulge in the forbidden fruit, was on the increase, though the working-class generally seemed to be better off for the restriction of alcoholic drinks. The temperance parties all over the world watched the American experiment with keen interest. An agitation was soon developing for a repeal of the Volstead Act—the "bootlegging" industry incidentally throwing its wealth lavishly on to the prohibitionist side. In 1930 a decision of the Supreme Court declared it to be no legal offence to possess

or to consume alcoholic liquor; to secure convictions manufacture, importation, or sale would have to be proved. In the same year the Court of New Jersey ruled that the whole Volstead Act was illegal, on the grounds that the constitutional amendment had been submitted to the State Legislature instead of to a specially elected convention. This decision was reversed on appeal, but it was by now evident that public opinion disapproved the continuance of prohibition, and a repeal of the constitutional amendment of 1919 was submitted to the States in 1933. By the end of the year the necessary three-quarters majority was secured, and the great Prohibition experiment came to an end, the event being celebrated by the "wet" supporters with tumultuous rejoicings. Eleven of the separate States, however, retained local prohibition.

Another wave of lawlessness arose in connection with the revival of the Ku Klux Klan, the anti-negro organisation of the days following the Civil War. The revived Klan of 1921 had a much wider selection of enemies than the original association, including in its proscribed categories Jews, Roman Catholics, and Communists, together with the original negro enemy. The Klan movement of 1921 was largely artificial, and soon degenerated into miscellaneous brigandage, members of the Klan levying blackmail on all and sundry. It did succeed, however, in reviving the fury of anti-negro feeling in the South, where out of sixty-three lynchings during the year 1921 all but four were carried out on negroes, several being burnt alive. In 1922 there were fifty-seven lynchings, including fifty-one negroes. The activities of the movement continued for a year or two, in spite of some prosecutions; but even in the South public opinion began to turn against it, and a campaign of press ridicule eventually killed it as an important factor in the situation.

One form of crime which increased greatly during this period was kidnapping. Members of the families of wealthy men were carried off by gangs that proceeded to collect ransom-money from the relatives of the prisoners. This kind of crime was particularly heinous when it took the form of tearing young children from their mothers and securing the money by threats to kill the infants. Public opinion was roused to fever heat by the kidnapping of the baby son of the world-famous airman Lindbergh, a case in which the money was paid and the child killed. After exhaustive enquiries a man was arrested, tried, and executed for this crime,

but it was believed that other persons still more guilty had escaped justice. In 1934 kidnapping was made a federal offence in cases where the perpetrators worked in more than one State and in numerous other ways the powers of the Federal police organisation were strengthened. Following the wave of public opinion, there was a more determined drive against organised crime than at any previous time, and several notorious gangsters were rounded up. Hitherto there had been more "executions" of gang-criminals by members of rival gangs—who occasionally fought pitched battles with machine-guns in the streets of the big cities—than by the public executioner. The notorious Al Capone, responsible for a host of murderous crimes in Chicago, was punished by the Courts for falsification of income-tax returns but not for his other offences; in 1934 the equally notorious John Dillinger, known as "Public Enemy Number One", was hunted down and shot by the police. There were signs that American public opinion was becoming far less tolerant of blackmail and murder than it had previously shown itself.

American political morality showed little tendency to improve. In 1922 great scandals were revealed in connection with the Government's handling of the shipping subsidies granted during the war. No proper accounts or records had been kept, and there remained some 300,000,000 dollars—equivalent at par to £60,000,000—unaccounted for. Two years later the whole American public was roused by the scandals connected with the leasing of the Government's oil-reserves. Oil-bearing lands had been bought up by the Government as a source of supply for the navy, and those portions of the estates which were not wanted immediately had been leased out to private individuals. It transpired that when the Californian reserves were leased to a contractor named Doherty, and the Teapot Dome reserve in Wyoming to a man named Sinclair, there was no competitive tendering, the price asked was ridiculously low, and the two contractors had handed over large sums—totalling 275,000 dollars (£55,000)—to two members of the Federal Government "on loan". There were some resignations from the Government, and a loud outcry for retribution agitated the Press for some months. The original prosecution of those connected with these scandals was quashed on a technical irregularity, and by the time the matter came before the Courts public interest had almost

entirely evaporated. Doherty was compelled to terminate his lease, but Sinclair kept the Teapot Dome concession. On appeal both concessions were terminated, the matter hanging on until the year 1927.

The Puritan element in American life attained its most spectacular development in 1925, when what was known as the "Monkey trial" took place at Dayton, Tennessee. The States of Tennessee, Florida and Texas had prohibited the teaching of the doctrine of Evolution in their schools, on the grounds that such teaching was contrary to Holy Writ. A Dayton teacher was fined 100 dollars for ignoring the prohibition. He won on appeal, but only on the grounds that the fine was excessive; Georgia and Mississippi followed suit by banning evolutionary theories in their schools. Arkansas went even further in 1928, excluding Webster's famous dictionary from its schools as its comments on the word "evolution" were not orthodox. In another sphere the State of Kansas distinguished itself by a law prohibiting the sale of cigarettes, though this was repealed in 1925.

Apart from the great prohibition controversy and occasional scandals of more than usual gravity, there was little interest in domestic politics during the ten years following the peace. Women's suffrage, after failing to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate in 1919, was passed in the following year, the States confirming this change in the Constitution. The Fordney-McCumber tariff, approved by Congress in 1922, represented the high-water mark of protection in America. The elections of 1920 returned 301 Republicans to the Lower House as against 133 Democrats, the remaining seat being captured by a Socialist; in the Senate there were 59 Republicans to 37 Democrats. The 1922 elections reduced the Republican majority in the Lower House to 15. In spite of this decline, due to the sudden slackening off of war-time industrial activity, the Republicans—who were the "Big Business" party—recovered their position with the development of national prosperity, and retained their majority until the great slump made its effects felt. Even the crash of the great speculation mania in 1929 did not overthrow the Republicans, though their majority sank to two in the House of Representatives elected in 1930. In 1932, however, there was a Democratic landslide, and the Democrats obtained a majority in both Houses. Harding, the Republican President, died in 1923,

his place being automatically taken by the Vice-President, Calvin Coolidge, who was elected President at the next regular vacancy in 1924—Dawes of the Reparations Plan being elected Vice-President. In 1928 the Republican Herbert Hoover was elected by a large majority, but on his standing for a second term of office in 1932, when the effects of the world economic crisis were being felt, he shared in the Republican *débâcle*, the Democrat Franklin Roosevelt defeating him by twenty-five million votes to sixteen million.

The temporary set-back to industry during the reversion from war production to peace conditions led to a good many strikes and some Communist agitation. Socialism had never been an important movement in the United States, and since the Russian Revolution Socialism and Communism had been linked together in the American mind as subversive influences that would, if unchecked, destroy American prosperity and civilisation. The Supreme Court in 1922 held that Trade Unions were responsible for the damages, direct and indirect, due to strikes, arguing the old "restraint of trade" rules of English common law and the Sherman anti-trust law. In 1920 there was a great round-up of Communists all over the Union; 6000 arrests were made, but it was discovered that of all these suspects only three were armed. With the rapid restoration of prosperity Labour troubles decreased, though certain industries witnessed important disputes between employers and workmen. In 1923 a protest of the association of Nonconformist Churches—the Federal Council of Churches of Christ—secured from the United States Steel Corporation a reduction of the normal working day from twelve hours to eight. A proposed amendment of the Constitution to enable the Federal Government to legislate for the control of child labour was baulked in 1925 through failure to obtain the consent of three-quarters of the States. There was a great upheaval when the Ford works economised by closing down for six months during the perfecting of a new type of car, for many of the employees—though extremely well-paid—had made no provision for this cessation of their regular employment. Interest in Communism revived in 1927 owing to the long-delayed trial of two Italians, Sacco and Vanzetti, accused of robbery and murder during the disturbances of 1920. Public feeling took sides on political grounds, it being the impression that the two

Italians were being tried rather as members of an advanced Socialist organisation than as mere law-breakers. The case excited an extraordinary interest all over the world, and when—after a special inquiry by four commissioners selected for their impartial positions—the two men were executed in 1927, there were anti-American riots in places as far distant as Buenos Ayres, Paraguay, Paris, Nice, Sweden, Spain and Australia.

In spite of the revolt against Wilson and his Covenant, the United States found it impossible to keep out of international complications. It was a curious adjunct to the Monroe Doctrine when the House of Representatives in 1919 passed a resolution in favour of self-government in Ireland by 216 votes to 41. Though refusing to take part in the European conferences that followed the treaties, America sent "observers" to those held at Genoa, Lausanne and Paris in 1922. American troops were allowed to remain in garrison on the Rhine until the beginning of 1923. In 1926 the Senate approved the idea of American participation in an international Court for the settlement of disputes, but with a reservation that there should be no interference with American interests. As a counterblast to the League of Nations idea of preventing war, the United States Government in 1928 took up the proposals of a lawyer named Salmon Levinson, who had long been agitating for an international pact of non-aggression. The Foreign Secretary, Kellogg, communicated these plans to Briand in France and to other Governments. The result was the signature of a formal pact—the "Kellogg Pact" renouncing recourse to war—between the United States and France. The Pact was signed by many other states, but with numerous reservations, Britain, for instance, excluding from the Pact certain areas in which "Imperial interests" might require armed intervention. Events outside America have now proved that the Kellogg Pact has been—to use Metternich's description of the Holy Alliance—"mere verbiage", and that it would be of no consequence whatever in any dispute between two powerful nations.

American relations with Japan became considerably strained after the peace treaties had given the Japanese a foothold in Shantung and in the southern Pacific, where some of the ex-German islands were handed over to them. In 1921 the United States Government made the Japanese Government clearly understand that the alternatives were a definite increase of American

naval strength as against Japan or an immediate settlement of all questions relating to China and the Pacific. The Japanese Government of the time considered it wiser to accept the more peaceable solution, and at the end of the year these negotiations developed into an invitation to all the naval Powers and those that were interested in China to come to a general agreement on their policy. On the motion of Senator Borah, who suggested a "naval holiday" of some years, during which the Powers would build no new warships, the American Senate invited the interested parties to a conference in Washington. Representatives of America, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Holland, Portugal, Belgium and China attended this conference, and the result was the signing of a series of treaties early in 1922. America, Britain, France and Japan signed a Four-power treaty guaranteeing non-aggression in the Pacific area against each other. Italy joined these four Powers in a Five-power treaty to restrict naval armaments as regards large ships to a ratio of equality for Britain and the United States, three-fifths of the American standard for Japan, and a third of the American standard for France and Italy. Submarine warfare was restricted to attacks on naval vessels, and the use of gas in naval warfare was prohibited. Britain strongly urged the abolition of submarine warfare, but was unable to carry this point. The Washington naval agreement was ratified by the three big naval powers, but France and Italy did not do so. All the participants in the conference signed and ratified a nine-power treaty guaranteeing non-aggression in regard to China.

The limitation of naval development was accepted by Japan with considerable misgiving, which was intensified when in 1924 the United States Government, following up the policy of restricting immigration, tightened up the immigration laws of 1921 and imposed a ban on all new Japanese immigrants except students and professional men. For many years America had allowed a moderate amount of Japanese immigration, under an arrangement known as the "gentleman's agreement", and protests against the termination of this working policy were loud in Japan, one man committing *hara-kiri* at the American embassy in Tokio. For peoples of the white races immigration was now restricted to 2 per cent of the numbers settled by each race in the States in the year 1890—the figure to be revised after three years. The selection of this rather odd date was deliberately arranged in

order to stimulate the Teutonic and British elements as against the Slav and Latin elements. America continued her restrictive policy, her Government aiming rather at consolidating American nationality than at collecting a huge population.

The increasing interference of the United States in the states of Latin America was producing a strong reaction against what was often called "Yanqui Imperialismo". In 1898 the Americans had intervened to save the inhabitants of the Spanish West Indies from the tyranny of Madrid, but when the Spanish forces had been expelled the Platt Amendment of 1901 established an American protectorate over Cuba—made effective by the Cuban treaty of 1903—whilst Porto Rico was annexed to the United States. Organised American commercial enterprise was soon in possession of the whole of the economic resources of Cuba, and a puppet Government was established at Havana under complete American control. For years President Machado ruled there as the agent of America, every rebellion against him being suppressed by American forces, until in 1933 a sudden popular rising in Havana expelled the President and took a bloodthirsty revenge on the supporters of his Government. The United States had also assisted the people of Panama to establish their independence of Colombia, and then, when the Panama Canal was constructed, the Republic of Panama fell under American influence, whilst the Canal Zone was purchased and annexed to the United States. In 1926 a new treaty bound Panama to join the United States if the latter country should become engaged in war, but the Parliament of Panama refused to ratify it. In 1921 the United States at last obtained a formal recognition of the independence of Panama from Colombia, paying 25 million dollars to Colombia as compensation.

Disturbances in the two republics of the island of San Domingo during the period of the European War gave the United States the excuse to intervene in that island, where an American protectorate was established in Haiti and the Dominican Republic under the protection of garrisons of American marines. The latter state was evacuated in 1925, the former not until 1934, when Franklin Roosevelt was President. A threatened rebellion in Haiti in 1929 was met by pacificatory measures; a Commission of inquiry reported in favour of the restoration of independence, and an evacuation was promised within seven years. The Hoover

Government, however, tried to negotiate a new arrangement to subject Haitian finances to American control, and the definite renunciation of political domination in Haiti was not made until Roosevelt's presidency. Disorders in the central American republic of Nicaragua led to similar intervention by American marines during the war period, and though the occupation was terminated in 1925, renewed fighting between the political factions of the country led to the return of the marines to Blue-fields next year. Economic interests were now completely dominated by America, but the political upheavals went on as before, Diaz, Chacon and Orellana fighting each other for the presidency, whilst General Sandino maintained an anti-American force of guerillas in the mountains of the north. The second evacuation of Nicaragua, in 1932, was brought about as a result of the protests against the Japanese occupation of Manchu Kuo; it would somewhat strengthen the hands of the United States in its attitude towards Japan if she had no Manchu Kuo of her own in Central America. The Nicaraguan factions were left to continue their tumultuous political contests—as recently as 1936 there was a revolutionary change of Government in the republic, President Sacasa being expelled and exiled by General Somoza, who installed his friend Dr Jarquin as President. In Mexico, in spite of constant rebellions and revolutions, and even in face of serious threats to American oil-concessions, the United States did not repeat the armed intervention of 1913, when the fleet bombarded Vera Cruz. In retaliation for a raid by General Villa's bandits, who crossed the frontier and fired into the town of El Paso, American troops occupied Juarez in 1919, but on the dispersal of the brigands the force was withdrawn.

These numerous interventions in the affairs of the smaller republics provoked strong opposition among the Latin states generally. The United States had hitherto exercised an effective veto on the membership of the Pan-American conferences, excluding revolutionary Governments that were obnoxious to it; at the conference of 1923—held in Chile—this customary veto was repudiated by the other members of the congress. Pan-Latinism was replacing Pan-Americanism as the dominant note of the proceedings. To placate its critics, the American Government took a studiously moderate line at the 1928 conference—held in Cuba—and declared that its "special responsibilities"

outside its own borders were limited to the countries lying north of the isthmus of Panama. In this year, too, President Hoover made a "goodwill" tour of the countries of Latin America, and henceforward American imperialism was considerably less conspicuous in the speeches of political leaders. For some time after the war there had been constant talk of America's achievement in "cleaning-up" the lesser states of the New World.

On the other side of the world American imperialism made itself manifest. The Philippines, saved, like Cuba and Porto Rico, from the misrule of Spain in 1898, had been promised independence, and a Parliament had been called into being under the mild and beneficent rule of American Governors. In 1923, however, through fear of Japanese expansion in the Pacific and a realisation of the enormous opportunities for economic exploitation presented by the islands, American policy underwent a change. The complacent Burton Harrison was succeeded in the post of Governor by the autocratic General Wood, who, unable to secure as much obedience as he wanted from the parliamentary leaders, suppressed Parliament for a time altogether. The Filipinos had never liked American rule, and had expected immediate emancipation in 1898. Aguinaldo, the rebel leader who had fought both the Spaniards and the first American administration, was now on the American side, but other leaders appeared who agitated strongly. Neither the Catholic descendants of the Spanish settlers nor the Mohammedan "Moors" of the southern islands welcomed General Wood's methods, and in 1926 there were riots and risings among both classes. Yet the United States Government was not absolutely averse to compromise, and in this year some support was given to a bill for granting independence to the northern part of the archipelago, whilst annexing the southern part—which was mainly "Moor"—to the United States.

Then by a strange development the Filipinos obtained allies in the American Congress. The tobacco and sugar trusts in the States were beginning to feel the pressure of Filipino competition, which was at present outside their control. To solve their own difficulties in this matter, their supporters in the Senate in 1929 introduced a resolution in favour of complete independence for the Philippines, so that their exports could be subjected to high tariffs as those of a foreign country. This view eventually prevailed, and in 1932 the Philippines Independence Act was

passed, providing for a constituent assembly to draw up a new Philippine Constitution, which was to be submitted to a plebiscite. An "interim" period of ten years was arranged during which the United States was to control finance and police, whilst for the same period the Supreme Court of the United States was to exercise appeal jurisdiction. Finally the Act was made conditional on its acceptance by the existing Filipino Parliament within two years. President Hoover vetoed this bill, but under the American Constitution he could only delay its passage, and it was passed into law in 1933. The Filipino Parliament, however, demanded immediate freedom, and the bill failed to obtain a majority in the islands.

At the beginning of the year 1929 the United States seemed to have found the royal road to prosperity. Year after year since the peace her industry and commerce had increased. All classes were sharing in the continuously increasing wealth. From being a debtor nation, America had come to be a great creditor of the other peoples, for not only were there huge war-loans—the interest and repayment of which had been settled during the years 1923-25, except as regards France, which wanted to relate debt payments to receipts from German reparations—but large sums had been lent both to Governments and commercial ventures in Germany and in the new states of Europe. Economists had for long maintained that trade went in "cycles", periods of increasing production being followed by periods of slump when over-production had glutted the market, but in America it was held that rationalisation and efficiency had exempted the States from the operation of this economic phenomenon. At the end of the year 1929 the United States was plunged in a terrible trade depression, and there were three million unemployed.

The crash was precipitated by a wave of speculation similar to those of the South Sea Bubble in England and John Law's East India mania in France. As is always the case with these speculation epidemics, the few well-informed and lucky investors made huge fortunes, whilst the herd of amateur share gamblers were ruined. There was the usual list of bankruptcies, domestic tragedies and suicides, common to such cases. It was estimated that within a single month of the slide of share prices from their maximum American investors lost nearly £50,000,000. America is a land of small local banks, and more than 1300 of these failed. To add

to the distress a severe drought ruined the harvests in the western states, and prosperous America saw food-queues in the towns. The sudden ruin of tens of thousands of families appreciably reduced the purchasing power of the community, and as short-term lenders hurried to call in their money from Europe, a financial crisis of the first magnitude was provoked in Germany and elsewhere. Everyone affected began economising; purchases of American goods by Europeans fell off enormously, and the consequent dismissal of workmen in the United States still further reduced the demand for goods. The most severe example of the decline of the trade cycle had come in the land which had seen its biggest rise.

The slump continued with increasing severity all through 1930 and 1931; in 1932 there was a temporary rise in employment, but it proved illusory, and by the end of 1932 there were probably over ten million unemployed. It was estimated that close on a third of the workers had lost their jobs, and as the United States had never found it necessary to organise any system of unemployment insurance the distress was appalling. A moratorium for all international debts, proposed by President Hoover in 1931, was adopted after some discussion among the Powers, but it failed to stop the great depression, which had by now spread all over the world. For the first time in American history a proletarian revolution seemed to come within the range of practical politics. There were strikes against wage reductions, riots and political demonstrations, and in 1932 a body of 20,000 ex-soldiers, known as "veterans of the Great War", marched into Washington, camped in the city, and demonstrated before the House of Representatives, which—like a French Revolutionary Assembly—pacified the mob by voting the "veterans" a subsidy of some £500,000,000 in cash, a measure which was promptly rejected by the Senate. The Government meanwhile called troops into the city and expelled the invaders. Under these conditions the elections of 1932 were held; the Republicans, who for years had been successfully claiming credit for the unparalleled prosperity of the country, had now to bear the brunt of the reaction. The Republican President Hoover polled sixteen million votes, but the Democratic candidate Franklin Roosevelt polled twenty-five million, and a similar Democratic landslide took place in the elections to Congress.

During the last months of the discredited Republican administration, the economic condition of the country grew worse. The Hoover moratorium expired in 1932, but the debtor countries declared themselves unable to meet their obligations, and little money was received from this source. The United States protested the sanctity of financial pledges, but in vain. Rumours of wholesale default led to a panic run on banks in many parts of the States. It was in the very nadir of this fresh crisis that Franklin Roosevelt assumed office as President, in March 1933. Roosevelt, who had served in a minor office under President Wilson and had held the post of Governor of New York State for the last few years, had the reputation of a mild and pleasant gentleman, a cripple—the result of infantile paralysis—who was unlikely to prove a very inspiring leader, in spite of his distant family connection with President Theodore Roosevelt. His nomination as Democratic candidate was the result of a quarrel between the supporters of men who were regarded in the party as of greater importance—Al Smith, McAdoo and Ritchie. He began his term of office by a quiet broadcast appeal for common-sense and level-headedness, in terms quite unlike the usual type of flamboyant political manifesto; after closing the banks for a period of several days he ordered them to resume payment, accompanying this order with a clearly reasoned appeal to depositors to help recovery by replacing their withdrawals instead of making disaster certain by bleeding the banks of their last resources of capital. The remarkable success of this quiet appeal was of good augury for Roosevelt's administration, and in a special session of Congress he gave further promise of level-headed statesmanship by economy cuts, including 500 million dollars on war pensions (equal to £100,000,000 current English money) and advising for revenue purposes only a relaxation of the Volstead Act to allow trade in beer containing a maximum of 3·2 per cent alcohol. In this session the President was given emergency powers over the export of gold and silver and the sale of foreign exchange, and over all matters of currency and credit. Under these powers, he abandoned the gold standard, debasing the value of the dollar by 20 per cent at the end of 1933 and by another 20 per cent a few months later. Other financial measures included a restriction of the power of banks to speculate with their depositors' money and the imposition of heavy

penalties for the issue of lying prospectuses as bait for speculators' money.

Among all the sufferers from the economic crisis, the farming community were the hardest hit; the agricultural areas of the west were at the point of desperation. To bring relief to this section of the community, the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed, providing on the one hand for a restriction of the area under cultivation, so that by reducing the supplies prices would be forced up, and on the other hand for subsidies to the farmers to enable them to tide over the period of price-adjustment. These subsidies took the form of assistance with payments on mortgages and compensation for reduced acreage under production, the latter money being raised by a special tax on manufacturers of articles made from agricultural products, thus further tending to raise the price of farm-produce. Certain special grants were made to extreme cases of distress. The total cost of the subsidies under the Act was estimated at £400,000,000. As a result a huge acreage was put temporarily out of cultivation, including a quarter of the cotton-lands, and prices soon began to rise. The improvement would have been still greater if the restriction of production had been strictly observed; there were many cases in which farmers took the subsidy and continued to produce on the same scale as before without meeting with drastic punishment.

A further £100,000,000 was granted, by an Emergency Relief Act, to the unemployed, whilst a great reafforestation scheme covering the whole Union absorbed about a quarter of a million workers. Grants-in-aid to the separate states enabled a programme of new highways and other public works to be inaugurated. The Government gave orders for thirty-two new warships to be built. The establishment of anything like a regular "dole" for the unemployed, however, was regarded as both too costly and inadvisable, and the efforts of the Administration were directed more to stimulate industrial recovery than to provide relief for those out of employment.

The National Industrial Recovery Act—usually referred to as the N.I.R.A.—arranged for voluntary agreements between employers and employees to increase wages, shorten hours, and generally improve the conditions of labour. The aim was the raising of prices by establishing a minimum charge on industry

to provide a decent standard of living for every worker. Considerable enthusiasm was roused for the new development, and in every industry industrial conferences drew up by agreement "codes" to regulate working conditions, whilst a governmental "blanket code" was issued which was intended to serve as a model for all industrial employments. When Franklin Roosevelt broadcast a request for personal letters from employers promising to help work the new system, the White House—the official residence of the President—was deluged with telegrams and correspondence. Employers vied with one another for the honour of wearing the blue eagle badge which signified acceptance of the N.I.R.A. codes. It was estimated that the general effect of this fresh start to industry was the absorption of two million workers into profitable employment. The first enthusiasm naturally wore down, and when low profits or deficits led some employers to modify or abrogate the codes there was a good deal of trouble, many industrial disputes and some strikes following. There was also much friction over the question whether the workers' side of the bargains should be supervised by general trade unions, as usually wanted by the men, or by factory committees in each separate firm, as was preferred by the employers. A unique experiment in industrial reorganisation was carried out in Tennessee, where a large area was planned for industrial development, unprofitable farms being put entirely out of cultivation and new factories being constructed at appropriate sites.

Franklin Roosevelt's legislation of 1933—widely known as "the New Deal"—was important, not only as a great series of crisis emergency measures, but as introducing into American politics a degree of communal control that had hitherto been alien to the traditions of the United States. Incidentally it carried forward the movement towards strengthening the central Federal Administration as against the local state legislatures. Such a drive, though accepted in the bad days of 1933, was bound to provoke strong opposition from the powerful vested interests of "big business", and a people so accustomed to the individualist outlook were certain to undergo a reaction when the enthusiasm accompanying the sense of novelty and heroism had died down. Another significant feature of the New Deal was the increased importance given thereby to organised Labour. Hitherto the general level of prosperity and the ease with which enterprising workers found

employment at remunerative rates had prevented the development of Trade Unionism to that degree of activity which characterised its counterpart in other industrial countries. Even under the stimulus of the N.I.R.A. codes, though Trade Union membership doubled, less than 10 per cent of the workers were drawn into the movement. The effect of this development on the employers was somewhat similar to the effect of the rise of the British Trade Unions on British employers in the nineteenth century. Union intervention was regarded as a pernicious novelty, and even in the negotiations for the codes it was obvious that a large proportion of the employers were entering the ranks of the Blue Eagles with great misgivings.

From the point of view of its immediate effects, the New Deal was not a very great success. It saved a large proportion of the nation from destitution, but its main aim—to stimulate production and thus reabsorb the army of unemployed into profitable employment—remained unachieved. At the beginning of 1934 there were fifteen millions unemployed on the Relief registers; by the end of that year it was estimated by some that a quarter of the nation was being wholly or partially maintained by Federal or State funds. The costs of relief—met mainly by heavy loans—were so great that during 1934 drastic restrictions had to be imposed on the various forms of public assistance, the Federal subsidies to public works, which had already cost £20,000,000, being suspended altogether. The encouragement of a great housing and slum-clearance campaign in 1934 did little to increase employment generally. Nevertheless the nation remained loyal to Roosevelt and the Democratic party. The elections of 1934 sent the Democrats back with a majority of more than two to one. The Republicans, it was feared, would be less generous in the way of public relief to a people who were still suffering acute distress, and even as an Opposition in Congress that party made little progress in weakening the prestige of the Administration.

It was natural that with the continuing distress revolutionary parties should attempt to stir up hostility to the whole capitalist system, but there was no serious increase in the Labour vote or in the membership of the Communist party. Far more successful were the great advertising campaigns of three groups of "reformers" who owed their rise to the economic crisis. Dr Townsend, of Long Beach, California, evolved a scheme

of "revolving pensions", the most important point of which was the grant of universal pensions of £500 a year at the age of sixty, on condition that the recipients put the money into general circulation by spending it during the twelve months. The scheme was to be financed by a tax on retail trade. Twenty-five million persons signed petitions to Congress in support of this panacea for America's troubles. A second group of moderate Socialists rallied round a priest named Father Coughlin, of Detroit, who carried on continuous propaganda for his "National League for Social Justice" by means of a private broadcasting-station. More sinister were the activities of the supporters of the millionaire gangster Huey Long, dictator of the state of Louisiana, which he represented in the Senate. Louisiana under Long's regime was so notoriously corrupt that Roosevelt refused to entrust the handling of any of the relief subsidies to its local officials; by a noisy and violent agitation Huey Long forced the President to give way, and then proceeded to bid for wider influence by a blatant campaign on "rob the rich to give to the poor" lines. In Huey Long's Utopia every family was to have £2000 a year, and the "Kingfish"—as he was nicknamed—obtained a large following in the adjacent states. This unpleasant individual's career, however, was cut short by the bullet of a man who felt that such tyrannicide was no murder.

The "New Deal" policy was continued steadily during the following years. In 1935 Federal legislation introduced National Health Insurance, Old Age Pensions, maternity and child welfare schemes, pensions for the blind, all subsidised by the central exchequer but run by the separate states, whilst the Federal Government was to establish a system of unemployment insurance and contributory pensions. Under the Pensions Act contributions—levied equally on employers and employed—were to be compulsory for all workers, whatever their wages might be; no pensions were to be payable before the year 1942, and the maximum pension was to be £4 a week. The scheme was not extended to persons engaged in agriculture, domestic workers, casual labourers, civil servants or sailors. The gradual recovery of economic activity throughout the world was reflected in the United States. In 1935, though at one time it was estimated that sixteen millions were unemployed, the figure went down to fewer than twelve millions by the end of the year. In 1936 the figure was reduced to nine

millions. The farming community underwent an addition to its tribulations as the result of another severe drought in 1934; prices rose considerably, but many farms were able to produce nothing of any consequence.

There is no doubt that the mass of the nation still had confidence in Franklin Roosevelt, and in 1936, on the expiry of his term of office, 60 per cent of the electors supported him against the Republican candidate, Governor Landon of Kansas: in every state except Maine and Vermont the Democrats had a majority of the votes. The vested interests that were attacked and threatened by the New Deal, however, were able to use a powerful weapon in their defence by challenging the legality of the recent measures in relation to the terms of the American Constitution, and in the Supreme Court—the final arbiter on constitutional questions—they found protection. During 1935 a whole series of decisions tore up the New Deal piecemeal. The cancellation of clauses in business contracts stipulating for payment in gold was held to apply to private contracts only, not to those of the Government, so an Act was hurried through to bar claims for damages against the Administration. The five-year moratorium granted to the farmers in respect of their mortgages was declared illegal, as was the tax on agricultural products used in manufacture. Wages and hours of labour, it was decided, could not be dealt with by the Federal Government, and there was thus no possibility of legal enforcement of the codes arranged under the N.I.R.A. The Railways Pension legislation was declared illegal. Government electricity works constructed as a measure of relief for unemployment must not compete with private enterprise—this was aimed particularly at the Tennessee regional planning scheme. The Act restricting the transport of oil was condemned as unduly vague. Finally, the President's action in dismissing a Government Trade Commissioner who was entirely out of sympathy with the policy of the Administration was reversed. In 1936 even the state legislation of New York to secure a minimum wage for women and children was condemned as illegal; as a result of this decision similar legislation in seventeen other states was nullified.

Roosevelt was not dismayed by these set-backs to his policy. He had three choices before him: he could submit a constitutional amendment adding considerably to the powers of the Federal Government; he could attempt to modify the personnel

of the Supreme Court; he could devise ingenious methods of evading the decisions of the Court. To secure the permanence of the codes, the President tried to arrange a voluntary organisation on a national scale, but the National Association of Manufacturers rejected his suggestion by a four to one majority. To avoid the total collapse of the agricultural relief measures he secured the passing of an Act to transfer the administration of the schemes to the separate states, which were to be subsidised from the federal treasury. Meanwhile he prepared an attack on the Supreme Court—the bulwark of the Opposition—whose nine members usually divided into the same groups, four judges repeatedly voting against the Government case, three supporting it, and two being sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other.

In 1937 the President laid before the Senate a project for increasing the number of Supreme Court Judges from nine to fifteen, it being his intention to override the conservative majority by the addition of six supporters of the New Deal. There at once began throughout the States a controversy reminiscent of the House of Lords agitation in Britain in 1910 and 1911. Roosevelt's supporters argued that the framers of the Constitution, while safeguarding the judicature from interference at the hands of the other organs of the Constitution, had never intended it to challenge the validity of statutes duly passed by the Legislature, and that the claim to veto laws had not been raised before 1803 and never exercised until 1856. Since then, however, seventy Acts had been invalidated by this usurped jurisdiction. The Supreme Court, like the British House of Lords, had, it was declared, rejected and delayed many laws which were now universally regarded as beneficial. The opponents of the President threw themselves mainly on the duty of defending the great Constitution of 1787, the pride of America. If it so happened that judges selected for their legal qualifications should be conservative in political opinions, that was no reason for swamping the Bench with men chosen unblushingly for their political bias. The Supreme Court might now be an obstacle to the New Deal; at some future date it might prove an equally strong barrier to Communism, and if the President's attack were successful it would form a good precedent for action by a Communist Administration. There was also much subsidiary argument on the capacity of the judges, and much was made of the fact that out of some 1100 cases a year 700

were refused a hearing. Meanwhile the Court modified its attitude considerably, and three months after the New York Labour case it decided in exactly the opposite sense in a similar challenge to the Labour laws of the state of Oregon.

The number of judges depended on the decree of the Senate, having fluctuated between five and ten; it had remained at nine since 1869. The agitation against the President's proposals was successful both within and without Congress. The project was eventually rejected in the Senate by 70 votes to 20, the majority of the Democratic Senators refusing to follow Roosevelt in this matter. The Republican Opposition made the most of this defeat, and roundly abused Roosevelt as a Dictator and an enemy of the Constitution. Undaunted, however, the President continued to urge the need of Supreme Court Reform, and on the retirement of Judge Van Devanter he nominated as his successor Senator Black, one of the most open champions of the New Deal policy. It was customary for the Senate to accept the President's nominations to vacancies in the Supreme Court; on this occasion the appointment was delayed, but in the end the President's choice was confirmed. It was generally held that the conflict had weakened Roosevelt's popularity, at least in the urban areas.

Much depended on the attitude of organised Labour, which was rapidly rising to a position of importance in American politics. There were two divergent groups in the movement: the American Federation of Labor, led by William Green, upheld the usual system of national Unions in each industry, whilst the Committee for Industrial Organisation, headed by John Lewis, advocated comprehensive Unions representing all the workers in a single firm. There were numerous strikes—some of them of the "sit down" type now popular in France, when the employees occupied the factories to prevent work being done—during 1936 and 1937. The Lewis organisation was inclined to regard Roosevelt as a dictator; Green's followers supported the President as "the greatest friend of Labour who has ever sat in the White House". Roosevelt had just secured the passing of the Government Contracts Act, guaranteeing all contracts over £2000 in value to firms that were paying good wages. A popular but less statesmanlike Act of 1936 awarded the gratuity promised by Hoover to the ex-soldiers. A total sum of £450,000,000 was thus distributed; it was intended that the recipients should put the

money back into circulation by paying debts and buying commodities.

The concentration of the Administration on the crisis at home led to a marked departure from the policy of "Yankee Imperialism". In 1934 Cuba was at last given complete independence, and at the same time the marines were withdrawn from Haiti. In the same year a revised Act for Philippine independence provided for the proclamation of a new Constitution for the islands in 1935, to be followed by complete independence in 1945. A treaty with Panama in 1936 avoided the military dependence which had proved objectionable to the smaller Republic. With European Governments there was at first considerable friction, owing to their defaulting on war-debt payments at the expiry of the Hoover moratorium. Even Great Britain, usually punctilious in payments and generous where Government debts were concerned, contented herself with the offer of a nominal sum—called a "token payment"—in recognition of her liabilities. Senator Johnson secured the passing of an Act forbidding the issue in the United States of any loans issued by those Governments that continued to default in payment of war debts; the only result of this was to make Britain withdraw even the offer of token payments. The feeling of irritation caused by the general default of the European debtors was largely responsible for the sudden refusal of the United States to continue its participation in the World Economic Conference held in London in 1933, but separate negotiation with Britain and France in 1936 provided against commercial undercutting through depreciation of currency by agreements on the ratio value of the respective national currencies. "No foreign entanglements" remained one of the slogans of Franklin Roosevelt's Government, coupled with an abandonment of imperialist aims and a general policy of the "good neighbour". In 1934 the President was given emergency power to negotiate trade agreements with foreign countries, with power to reduce tariffs for bargaining purposes by 50 per cent. Some commercial openings were effected as a result, but the general adherence to high protection throughout the world limited the revival of American export trade to a narrow field.

In every country the fluctuations of the economic crisis were the occasion for violent political controversies, in which Governments took the credit or were given the blame for trade conditions

which, in the main, were universal and beyond the control of any single Government. The United States of America was no exception. The recovery witnessed during the period of the New Deal corresponded to the recovery that was noticeable in all countries during these years. Most of the spectacular measures adopted by Congress proved mere palliatives; the real importance of the New Deal lies in its strengthening of the Federal powers and in its encouragement of Labour legislation. How far either of these tendencies will prove permanent is a matter of speculation. An important problem for the United States lies quite apart from the controversies about Labour laws, tariffs, debt settlements, or the interpretation of the Constitution. The sinister power of "graft" hangs over American life as the Devil was believed to hover perpetually over the life of the mediaeval Christian. The closing of the gates on all but a thin trickle of alien immigration has made easier the consolidation of the American nation into a more homogeneous society and may enable a communal sense of ethical values to develop. Tammany Hall, with its unscrupulous electioneering methods, its concentration on the power of money to decide political fortunes, and its brazen use of the "Spoils system" to reward its supporters, is still a dominant feature of the politics of many states and municipalities. Perhaps the day will eventually come when Tammany Hall and its counterparts will evoke the reminiscent contempt awarded by Englishmen to the old "rotten boroughs" of the age of Pitt, and this happy consummation is the aim of the soundest type of American statesman.

MEXICO

The large Republic of Mexico, after its separation from the Spanish dominions early in the nineteenth century, had undergone the usual series of civil wars and revolutions which characterised Latin America. For some thirty years Mexico obtained comparative peace and order under the firm rule of the dictator Porfirio Diaz, who was expelled by a revolution in 1911, and the fall of Diaz once more opened the gates to the forces of disorder. The mild Madero was overthrown in 1913 by the ferocious tyrant de la Huerta, who never held more than a portion of the country and who was in turn overthrown by Carranza in 1916.

It took Carranza two years to establish his control over all the provinces, and even so it was only by allowing his chief enemy de la Huerta to remain as Governor of the province of Sonora in the north-west. "General" Villa, who was little more than a brigand chief, held out in the mountains of the north until 1920, when he surrendered and disbanded his men in return for a free pardon.

The mass of the population, both Spanish and Indian, were little better than serfs on the estates of the great landowners, and the condition of the *peon*—the Mexican peasant—had become even worse under the rule of Diaz, who had allowed the common lands of the peasantry to be absorbed by the lords of the soil, somewhat after the fashion of Tudor England. The rich natural resources of the country had been exploited almost entirely by foreign capitalists, who held enormous concessions and occupied in practice a privileged position in the Republic, though the interruption of foreign trade during the Great War had led to the establishment of numerous small manufacturing industries in the larger cities.

Carranza voiced the national feeling when he issued, in 1917, a paper Constitution proclaiming the principle of "Mexico for the Mexicans", denying that the foreigners had any peculiar rights or privileges, and emphasising the supremacy of the Mexican law over all land and other property in the country. He also decreed that the lost commons should be restored to the peons, and initiated a campaign against the over-mighty influence of the Catholic Church. In the Constitution of 1917 he inserted clauses to exclude the clergy from educational work and to place the vast Church estates under national ownership. Carranza, however, was never in a position to enforce his ideals on the country, for in spite of the apparent calm of the Republic at the end of 1919—when Villa was the only leader giving trouble—the situation was rather one of truce than of peace.

In 1920 Huerta raised the standard of rebellion in Sonora, and was joined by another hardened revolutionary, General Obregon. Carranza was murdered by his own troops, and Huerta entered Mexico City in triumph; he allowed Obregon to take the presidency, preferring to hold the Ministry of Finance himself. Obregon—who, like Nelson, had lost an arm in battle—combined the firmness of Diaz with the idealism of Madera, and under

his presidency Mexico was better governed than for many years. Brigandage was more severely repressed, a business-like debt agreement was made with the foreign bankers, and in 1923 the United States, which had for long refused to recognise the ephemeral Governments of Mexico, entered into formal diplomatic relations with President Obregon. For the first time steps were taken to carry out Carranza's promises to restore the commons to the peons, and a statute was obtained from the Assembly to partition some of the large estates into small holdings for the peasantry. The result was to make Obregon the idol of the peons, who became as confident and truculent towards their former landlords as they had hitherto been timid and submissive. Among the victims of the peons' truculence was an English-woman, Mrs Evans, who was subjected to a series of attacks on her person and property; the British representative in Mexico delivered a protest to the Government and was expelled from the country for his pains. The subsequent murder of Mrs Evans led to a complete estrangement between the British and Mexican Governments.

Under the Constitution of 1917 the President cannot be re-elected after the expiry of his four years of office. When Obregon completed his term of office in 1924 he duly refrained from trying to upset this arrangement, nominating his friend and supporter General Calles as his successor. Altogether twenty-two candidates contested this presidential election, including de la Huerta, who had high hopes of winning. Furious that Obregon had given his support to Calles rather than to the man who had put him in power in 1920, Huerta raised a rebellion at Vera Cruz, but was driven out after a brief campaign. The election returned Calles with a large majority.

President Calles was as vigorous a ruler as Obregon had been, and was even more nationalist in ideas. He resolved that his presidency should be marked by the enforcement of those clauses of the 1917 Constitution which established full state control over the foreigners and over the Church. In 1925 he submitted to Congress a Bill which, if passed, would present the foreign land-owners and concessionaries with the alternative of selling out within three years or becoming naturalised Mexicans; the Bill was passed in the following year, amended to restrict its operation to the most settled areas—all within 50 kilometres of the coast

or within 100 kilometres of the land-frontiers. A supplementary Act of 1926 empowered the Government to modify the terms of all oil-concessions, the intention being to reduce their duration. The new laws provoked a storm of opposition in the United States, the country most interested in the foreign concessions, and there was open talk of war. Calles held firm to the main principle of the Acts, but was willing to allow modifications in practice. Eventually it was agreed that no action should be taken against companies which would restrict the shares of foreigners to 50 per cent of the subscribed capital, and that a ten years' moratorium should be allowed to enable the necessary sales of the shares over and above the permitted quota. Finally the whole practical import of the legislation was knocked on the head by the concession of total exemption in respect of the areas that were actually being worked, as distinguished from those merely earmarked for future development. The United States accepted this compromise, and the tension was eased. The British Government—now under Macdonald's leadership—also relaxed its hostile attitude, and in 1925 diplomatic relations were restored in that direction.

Calles next turned to the question of the Church, and in 1926 Congress approved Acts to nationalise Church property, to restrict the educational activities of the priests, and to expel the numerous foreign priests and nuns from the country. The clergy were strictly forbidden to take part in political activities, and religious services were to be held within doors and not in the open air. These decrees roused a most formidable opposition, for the Catholic Church had a strong hold over a large section of the nation. The Archbishop of Mexico, Mora y del Río, organised a National League for the Defence of Religious Freedom, which declared an "economic boycott" until Church rights should be respected. Good Catholics were told to withdraw their money from the banks and to restrict their purchases of commodities to essentials; there was a noticeable slump in women's luxury articles. The new Acts were to come into force on 1 August, and on that day the Archbishop put the country under an interdict, all churches being closed—as happened in England in the far-away days of King John.

The Government showed no wavering. The League leaders were put under arrest; religious teaching was stopped in the schools; the Papal Legate was deported. Orders were issued for

the disarming of those who refused to accept the new laws, and house-to-house searches were made in many towns. Here and there fights occurred, but the resistance was in the main passive. Pilgrimages were stopped, and when the Yaqui Indians of Sonora rose in revolt to protest against the closing of the shrine of St Francis at Magdalena they were dispersed by troops. In 1927 the Archbishop of Mexico and five other bishops were put under arrest. Several priests were executed—some without trial. The whole country was soon seething with religious strife. Under these circumstances the political opponents of Calles and Obregon considered the time propitious to effect another revolution, particularly as the Constitution was amended at the end of 1926 to allow an ex-president to resume office at the expiration of four years from his resignation—an obvious move to restore Obregon. General Serrano, one of the unsuccessful candidates at the presidential election of 1924, headed a rebellion of troops in Mexico City, supported by another rising at Vera Cruz; the rebels were overpowered and the General was executed. General Gomez, another candidate, headed a rising at Vera Cruz and was defeated, fleeing the country. De la Huerta, who remained in the United States, intrigued with all the malcontent groups. In 1928 a rebellion took place in the west, in the State of Jalisco. Several attempts were made to assassinate Obregon before the election; when election day came his most promising rivals had all been exiled or cowed, and he was returned unopposed; then he was assassinated by a young Catholic fanatic. The Vice-President, Gil, took over the presidency provisionally, and a new election was ordered for the following year. When the assassin of Obregon was executed, the opponents of the Government organised a demonstration of sympathy at his funeral, and on the following day an attempt was made to murder the Acting-President.

In 1929 Mexico seemed to be on the verge of utter anarchy. That active volcano Vera Cruz threw up another rebel leader in General Jesus Aguirre. In the north-east, General Escobar seized Monterey, whilst an independent force of rebels was operating in the north-west. The Catholic extremists—the *Cristeros*—rose along the west coast. Ex-president Calles now took supreme command of the Government troops. Vera Cruz was captured, and General Aguirre taken and shot. General Escobar was routed in a two days' battle at Jiminez in the north, and fled to

the United States. Then the smaller rebel armies were dispersed in turn. The civil war of 1929 was followed by a host of executions, whilst fifty generals were dismissed from the army and fifty-two members of Congress were expelled from their seats. It was under these conditions that the presidential election was held. Calles refrained from standing as a candidate, putting up Rubio as his nominee. There were two other candidates, and the election was marked by riots and murders; Rubio was elected by a large majority.

Meanwhile Calles was negotiating with the Pope for a Concordat which might end the distressing state of religious strife. A compromise was eventually arranged; the Church received back its lands, but the foreign clergy were not to be reinstated, whilst on the education question religious instruction was allowed in churches but not in schools. The interdict was at last raised, and a fresh start was made in the relations between Church and State. For three years the question gave no serious trouble.

The nationalist and anti-clerical movement encouraged the spread of other revolutionary doctrines. Communism had been sedulously fostered by the Soviet agent since 1925, and there had been riots in that year when Communists contested the municipal elections at Vera Cruz. The Governor of the state of San Luis Potosi turned Communist, and was soon in conflict with the people of that province, being expelled with the aid of Government troops. Calles had encouraged a more moderate Labour movement, and in 1925 a Trade Union Council was established. After peace was restored with the Church Rubio's Government adopted a more hostile attitude to the Communists, whose doctrines were now spreading rapidly. Numbers were sent to jail or expelled from the country, and diplomatic relations with Russia were severed in 1930. Rubio completed what would have been Obregon's second term of office without much more serious trouble, though he was shot at and wounded after his inaugural speech in 1930 and there was a small rising in the extreme north in the same year. In 1931 Mexico joined the League of Nations, with the proviso that she did not recognise the Monroe Doctrine as interpreted by the United States.

The religious question flared up again in 1932, after three years' quiescence. Some of the separate states had instituted legislation which restricted the activities of the Church—Vera Cruz, for

instance, limiting the number of priests to one for every hundred inhabitants of the state. Catholic leaders criticised the Government freely in their journals, whilst the educational compromise did not work smoothly. In 1932 the Papal Legate, after denouncing the attitude of the Government towards the Church, was expelled from the country. The Pope issued a public protest against the treatment of Catholics in Mexico. Then the Catholic journals were suppressed, and in 1934 every Bishop in Mexico was expelled from the country. This time it was the secular arm that began closing churches; this action was adopted by five of the states. In the state of Guerrero, on the south-west coast, all priests were expelled. General Rodriguez, who succeeded Rubio as President in 1932, showed himself an uncompromising foe of the Church, whilst his Labour proclivities were more extreme than those of Calles. His most famous action in this direction was to order the teaching of Socialist principles in schools and universities, a move which provoked serious riots in Mexico University.

In 1934 Rodriguez was succeeded by General Cardenas, the election passing off quite peacefully. There was a small rising in Puebla in 1935 and several members of Congress were suspended on a charge of conspiracy. Calles had now lost all influence with the Government, and spent his time between active plotting and periods of voluntary or enforced exile. In 1936 the fallen Bolshevik leader Trotsky sought refuge in Mexico, the humorists remarking that he had come to learn the art of Revolution. Since Calles restored order in 1929 Mexico has been less disturbed by disorders than at any time since the dictatorship of Diaz, but politics are still mainly a matter for negotiation between powerful military leaders. Labour movements abroad placed much hope in the development of the Mexican Labour movement, but this affected only a small part of the population, and was much woven up with anti-clericalism and the anti-foreigner movement, as well as with the intrigues of the military chiefs. The tone of social and political life in Mexico is still largely affected by that somewhat tawdry domestic militarism which has appealed to many Latin Americans. When Calles introduced reforms into the army in 1925 he placed five hundred generals on the retired list, but there are still many officers left who flaunt this distinguished title. Banditry on the grand scale is rife in several provinces: in 1937

a town within 150 miles of the capital was sacked by a band of 300 outlaws, who murdered the mayor, the town clerk, and many other persons. Mexico is one of those countries where "anything might happen".

CENTRAL AMERICA

Central America, divided between six Republics with an aggregate population of less than seven millions, saw a crop of revolutions and rebellions in the course of the twenty years after the Great War. Guatemala expelled its President in 1920; and saw an unsuccessful rebellion in 1929; Honduras experienced rebellions in 1924 and 1931; Nicaragua was in a perpetual state of violent strife, which called for the intervention of the United States; Salvador saw a revolutionary change of President in 1931; Costa Rica and Panama alone remained quiet.

Another of the recurring schemes for a union of these small states came to the fore in 1920, when a conference was held at San José, Costa Rica, to discuss federation. As a result Guatemala, Honduras and Salvador formed a "Republic of Central America" in 1921, leaving it open for the other states to come in on some future date. The unity was nominal rather than real, for though the constituent states agreed to submit to joint management in all matters "where the interests of all were concerned", the only immediate result was the establishments of a consultative council for foreign relations at Tegucigalpa, in Honduras. In 1923, however, a customs-union was signed embracing all the Central American Republics except Panama.

CUBA

The long tutelage of the Republic of Cuba to the United States was brought to an end, not so much by the rising against President Machado in 1933, as by the abandonment of the imperialistic policy by Franklin Roosevelt. On Machado's expulsion in 1933 Havana was given over to an orgy of anarchy and revenge. De Cespedes took over the Government of the Republic, but was driven out by the local troops, who installed San Martin as President. The followers of De Cespedes held out in the National Hotel at Havana until driven out by artillery fire.

San Martin, after quarrels with the military coterie, gave place to Colonel Mendieta in 1934; this change of Government was celebrated by the placing of a bomb under the President's chair. In spite of the fact that the United States Embassy was fired at five times in four months, Roosevelt persevered with his "good neighbour" policy, and in 1934 the complete independence of Cuba was recognised by the American Congress.

The island republic, which has a population of four millions, has not passed a very happy time since its liberties were restored. In 1935 from every part of the island were reported strikes, sabotage, destruction of crops, bomb-throwing and shootings; martial law was proclaimed, and the death penalty was imposed for destruction of sugar-plantations. There were hundreds of arrests. After six provisional presidents had held office in three years, Gomez was formally elected in 1936; he began his term of office by vetoing a bill for imposing a sugar-tax to pay for military schools, and he was promptly impeached and deposed, the Vice-President Bru succeeding him in office.

VENEZUELA

Venezuela, with three million inhabitants, remained under the firm rule of Juan Gomez from 1909 to 1935, though he did not always occupy the position of President. The dictatorship of Gomez followed a period of continual anarchy since the revolt from Spain in the early part of the nineteenth century. Before 1909 there had been fifty revolutions in a period of eighty years. Not that Venezuela was free from rebellions; yet every movement was crushed in its early stages. Thus, there was a rising in the north-west under General Gabaldon in 1929, and another in 1930, whilst in 1923 the Vice-President was assassinated, and there were riots among the students of Caracas in 1928. The attention of foreign observers was drawn to these movements by two spectacular events in 1929. A party of 500 would-be rebels made a daring raid on the Dutch island of Curaçao to obtain arms; they took the fort of Willemstad by surprise, seized the stores of arms there, commandeered an American steamer in the harbour, and took the Governor of the island away as a hostage, releasing him only when they had safely landed the stolen weapons at La Vela. Another party, wanting to convey a rebel party from the west to

the east of Venezuela without arousing the suspicion of the Dictator, took the trouble to go all the way to Europe, booking passages on a German steamer which left Danzig for South America: when off the Venezuelan coast they overpowered the crew, took the western rebels on board, and landed them safely at Cumana, then restoring the ship to its owners.¹

Gomez died in 1935 at the age of seventy-eight. His demise was the signal for a tumultuous rising, similar to that which followed the death of William the Conqueror. All and sundry proceeded to sack the presidential palace, and incidentally to revenge themselves on old enemies by assault and murder. The Government restored order by promising that the whole of the late dictator's wealth would be sequestered for the benefit of the State; it was estimated that nearly £7,000,000 worth of property was affected. The Dictator's executors afterwards brought an action against the Government for illegal confiscation.

BRAZIL

The great Portuguese-speaking Republic of the United States of Brazil, with a population of over thirty millions, had as turbulent a political life as the other South American republics, but its rebellions were rarely carried to success. In 1924 there was a serious revolt in São Paulo and in Bahia, whilst a battleship mutinied at Rio de Janeiro, being chased to Uruguay by the other battleship of the Brazilian navy and forced to submit. Troops put down the rising in São Paulo and by 1925 the country was fairly quiet, martial law being in force in eleven out of the twenty states. In 1926 there was another revolt in the extreme south, in Rio Grande do Sul. The Communist party was suppressed in 1927, but the rebellions had little of Communism about them, being of the usual South American type, the faction-fights of rival party leaders. Parliamentary politics were also of a violent character; in 1929 one member shot another after a more than usually heated debate. Next year there was an attempt to assassinate the Vice-President, Dr Vianna.

It was customary for the President to be chosen from the two most populous states in turn, these being Minas Gerais and São

¹ According to some accounts the vessel was specifically chartered for the purpose.

Paulo. This alternation was broken into by President Washington Luis, who in 1930 put up his friend Prestes—both were São Paulo men—and worked hard to secure his election, which was carried by a majority approaching half a million. Minas Geraes at once raised the standard of revolt, and was supported by the states of Parahyba and Rio Grande do Norte in the north-east. The ports of Pernambuco and Bahia were captured by the rebels, and an advance on the capital began. During the fighting the garrison of Rio revolted; the Government defence collapsed, and Prestes was deported along with Washington Luis. Getulio Vargas became President—a Minas Geraes nominee. In 1931 São Paulo rose in rebellion, but the rising was quickly suppressed.

Vargas had to face the depression that came as a result of the world economic crisis. The main export trade of Brazil was its coffee, and the fall-off in custom coincided with a huge growth of production encouraged by the big sales in the preceding years. The Government came to the aid of the coffee-growers, buying up enormous stocks, which were destroyed rather than that their entry to the market should still further lower the price of coffee. This policy of Government purchase and destruction of crops has been maintained in succeeding years. Vargas, an energetic man, also tried to improve labour conditions in Brazil, securing the enactment of an eight-hour day and a minimum wage. His administration was also far more economical than had been expected. Getulio Vargas, in fact, was of a type superior to most South American statesmen, and was soon cordially hated by most of the "old gang" politicians. His economies also necessarily made enemies, whilst his freely-expressed desire for a more unified country, and his project for abolishing the Senate—which represented the separate states in equal membership—was also unpopular. Nevertheless Vargas held his own by firmness and by the support of a large section of Brazilian opinion. A military revolt that broke out in several states—most severely in São Paulo—in 1932 was vigorously suppressed. A new Constitution on the lines proposed by Vargas was accepted by Congress in 1934, and Vargas was re-elected to the presidency.

Brazilian malcontents now began to copy the revolutionary parties of Europe by styling themselves Fascists and Communists, and in 1935 there were numerous arrests, mainly among the Communist leaders. A severe statute forbade revolutionary agita-

tion or propaganda and restricted the right of workers to strike. Communist groups—now more definitely under the influence of the Comintern—rose in Rio, Pernambuco, and Natal in 1935; the movements were suppressed by troops and martial law was imposed on the whole of the country. During the following twelve months a general round-up of malcontents of all descriptions was carried out, and 16,000 prisoners were soon awaiting trial. Vargas, whose experiences of parliamentary democracy in Brazil were far from edifying, was inclined to favour the Fascist ideas, and a party calling themselves the "Integralists" was formed to advocate the Corporative State.

The severance of diplomatic relations with Spain in 1936, on the ground that its Government was revolutionary, seemed to mark Brazil's alignment with the Fascist group of Powers. Far different reasons had led to Brazil's withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1926. When Germany was admitted to the League and given a permanent seat on the Council, Brazil, as the largest state of Latin America, demanded one too, and when this demand was refused Brazil resigned membership.

PARAGUAY

The small Republic of Paraguay, with less than a million inhabitants, witnessed a civil war which lasted from 1921 to 1923, the Opposition forces being ultimately beaten by those of the Government. Communism made its appearance here at the time of the economic crisis, and in 1931 there was a small Communist rising, which was suppressed. Public attention was for some years focused on the dispute with Bolivia over the Chaco and the ensuing war, which ended in the complete victory of the Paraguayans.¹ Colonel Raphael Franco, one of the heroes of this war, afterwards intrigued with the Communists and was deported. Returning from exile in Argentina in 1936, he raised a successful revolution, expelling the President, Ayala. The Government established under the presidency of Franco, however, was less Communist than Fascist; he proclaimed the totalitarian state, and announced a programme which included State control over all

¹ See p. 312.

industry and the distribution of unused land to 70,000 peasants. As in so many South American republics, it was the army that exercised real control in Paraguay; two more revolutions occurred in 1937, led by military officers, the first expelling Franco and the second restoring him to office.

URUGUAY

Uruguay, with a population of two millions, pursued a fairly quiet course compared with the other South American Republics. The important and populous city of Monte Video was strongly Socialist, and the Government adopted a good deal of Labour legislation, including the forty-eight-hour week, pensions at fifty, and health insurance, whilst all grades of education up to university standard were made free. Women were given the vote in 1921. The economic crisis brought trouble from the Communists, who attempted a revolution in 1931, with no success. In 1935, however, Uruguayan politics took on that violent character which marked those of its neighbours. A Government Senator shot an Opposition Senator in the lobby of the Houses of Parliament; an Opposition member shot the President. A rising at Rivera on the Brazilian frontier was suppressed by aeroplane-bombing. It was discovered that the Comintern was arranging for the assembly of a Communist force in Uruguay to invade Brazil, and diplomatic relations with Russia were thereupon severed.

ARGENTINA

The Argentine Republic, with a population of somewhat under ten millions, had attained a considerable prosperity as the exporter of raw materials, particularly as the greatest meat-exporting country of the world. Much British capital had been invested there, and since the Great War American mass-production succeeded in ousting many British manufactures from the Argentine market. The Argentine Parliament was both slack and corrupt—in 1925 the session was broken up as it proved impossible to persuade enough members to attend to obtain a quorum. Like most South American Republics Argentina had its great dictators, and for fourteen years after his first election as President in 1916,

Dr Irigoyen was the dominant personality of the Government. He had built up a party called the Radicals, and cultivated popularity among the masses by his extremely democratic social life. Like Louis Philippe of France, he loved to be seen in the company of labouring men. From 1916 to 1922 and again from 1928 to 1930 he held the position of President and followed a policy of strict nationalism, refusing to make even nominal adherence to either side in the Great War and, though agreeing to Argentina becoming a member of the League of Nations, taking little or no part in its meetings. His main trouble after the war was with the extreme Labour elements. Under the influence of foreign Communists, a general strike was declared in 1919 in all the important towns, and it was not till after severe fighting with the troops of General Dell' Epiare that industry resumed its normal course. There were more Labour troubles in 1921, when there were many strikes and some bombs were thrown. There was a more constitutional upheaval over Irigoyen's national pensions scheme of 1923. When the Assembly gave it statutory sanction the workers generally refused to accept the deduction of 5 per cent from their wages which was to be earmarked for the pension fund. Employers showed no desire to assist the Government in enforcing the scheme, and it was estimated that, in spite of some prosecutions, 90 per cent of the workers remained outside it. When the Supreme Court in 1925 decided that fines for default in contributions were illegal, the whole scheme was dropped.

The Administration of Dr Irigoyen was extravagant and corrupt, though opinions differed as to how far he was personally involved in its malversations. The beginning of the economic crisis, which was felt in the South American Republics as soon as the collapse of the speculation boom caused United States creditors to call in their short-term loans and the United States importers to curtail their orders, gave a fillip to a long-brewing movement for Irigoyen's overthrow. In 1930 General Uriburu raised an insurrection in Buenos Ayres, seized the presidency for himself, and put Irigoyen under arrest. But Uriburu had no wish to remain ruler of Argentina, and in the following year he ordered a fresh election for the presidency, his nominee Justo being returned by a majority of nearly two to one, the Radical candidates being prevented from entering the lists. Uriburu died a few weeks later. Dr Irigoyen was released in 1932, and he immediately

became the centre of plots for the restoration of the dominance of the Radical party; this led to a second arrest, along with a hundred of his supporters. Irigoyen was an old man—he was ignorant of the date of his birth, but was believed to be over eighty—and soon after his release in 1933 he died. His leading supporter, Dr Alvear, continued to agitate against Justo's Government, and in 1933 he was interned on Martin Garcia Island thirty miles across the River Plate from Buenos Ayres. There was an abortive mutiny in the army in 1933 and for some time the country was under martial law, the death penalty—which had been abolished in the Argentine some years previously—being now restored. There was a small Radical rising at Santa Fé, up the Parana River, at the end of the year, but this was soon suppressed. The next year the internees on Martin Garcia Island were given the option of exile in Europe or transference to the inhospitable clime of Patagonia. Dr Alvear and a score of others opted for Europe, forty-six others went to Patagonia.

The Government of Justo was little more satisfactory than that of Dr Irigoyen. In 1935 there were revelations of financial scandals in the Cabinet connected with the relations between the Government and the great meat-packing companies. Just after this excitement a man entered the Houses of Parliament and emptied a revolver into the Government benches, killing one member and wounding two others. Communist activity was renewed, and in 1936 the Communist party was suppressed by statute, whilst a new form of "popular" salute was invented, both hands being clenched above the head to indicate the true democrat's readiness to fight both Communism and Fascism. Justo's Government restored active participation in the League of Nations—Argentina had actually cancelled her membership in 1928—and took the leading part in the Pan-American Conference of 1936, held at Buenos Ayres, where the participants entered into a "pact" for mutual consultation in the event of any American State going to war against another. The rule of Justo's supporters appeared fairly settled, but, in spite of the exile or internment of its leaders, the Radical party still has great strength among the people of Argentina. At the presidential election of 1937—which was marked by rioting, arrests, and a plot to murder Justo—the Radicals polled only 25 per cent less than the Government supporters, whilst in the capital the Radicals had a large

majority. The Government candidate, the "National Democrat" Robert Ortez, defeated Dr Alvear, who had been nominated by the Radical Opposition, a third candidate—as Socialist—polling comparatively few votes.

CHILE

In Chile, a country with somewhat less than four million inhabitants, after a generation of corrupt Governments, dominated by the old aristocratic families of the Republic—known as "the Forty Families"—an enterprising statesman gained the presidency in 1920 and initiated a policy of reform, economy and Labour legislation. This leader, Arthur Alessandri, was soon anathema to the other politicians, and a conspiracy among the "Forty Families" in 1924 led to a military rising which expelled the President, without, however, appointing another one. Alessandri intended to go to Europe, but was recalled during his passage through the Argentine by his supporters, who wished to attempt a counter-revolution in the next year. A second rising of the troops took place, this time in support of Alessandri, and a reform in the Constitution was carried through. At the presidential election of 1925, however, the "Forty Families" successfully asserted their influence, and Alessandri was defeated by his opponent Figueroa Larrain. In 1927 Figueroa Larrain gave place to Colonel Ibañez, a man of dictatorial proclivities, who obtained from Congress the grant of emergency powers. Another revolution in 1931 deposed Ibañez and placed Montero in the presidential chair.

Chile was now feeling the effects of the world economic crisis and unrest increased enormously, taking a more Socialist and Communist tinge than before. Hardly had Montero been installed when a rising against him took place at Concepcion, in which part of the Chilean fleet joined. Hardly had these rebels been overcome when the Communists rose at Copiapo, whilst rioting broke out in the capital, Santiago. These insurrections were successfully suppressed, and early in 1932 the country was put under martial law. Then a rebellion of Socialist and Communist groups in Santiago succeeded in expelling Montero and proclaiming a Socialist Republic. After a fortnight a violent quarrel

broke out between the moderate Socialists and those inclined to Communism. The army supported the moderates, and the Labour leader Davila overcame the Communistic Grove. Some weeks later General Blanche expelled Davila and took power for himself; then General Vignola expelled Blanche. Meanwhile Alessandri, who had been living in Europe for some years, returned to Chile, where his name was still held in high respect by many thousands. At the end of 1932 Alessandri was elected President for the second time.

In spite of the distress caused by the bankruptcy of the great Nitrate Trust in 1933, Alessandri managed to retain the confidence of the people generally. A new Sales Corporation took the place of the ruined Trust—which was almost entirely a United States corporation—and a policy of strict economy was enforced. There was plenty of plotting against Alessandri's rule, 200 arrests being made during 1934; a small peasant rising occurred at Temuco, many landlords being assaulted and some murdered. Yet the President held to his task, and in three years order was restored and a distinct improvement in economic conditions set in. In 1935 the Andes railway—which had been inactive for a couple of years—resumed its services. In 1936 there was more trouble with the Communists, many being imprisoned, and all the provinces south of the capital were placed under martial law.

A long-standing dispute with Peru, after coming near to war, was amicably settled in 1929. After the war of 1879-83 between Chile and the allied Republics of Peru and Bolivia it had been decided that the provinces of Tacna and Arica should remain in Chilean hands for ten years, after which a plebiscite should be held to determine their final disposition. The plebiscite had been constantly postponed by the Chileans, and Peru found in this situation a perpetual grievance. In 1920 President Wilson of the United States tried to bring about a settlement and proposed that Peru should abandon her claims in return for a compensation-payment of £6,000,000. This was not agreeable to the Peruvians, and the matter continued to breed strife until 1925, when the United States again intervened, obtaining the consent of both parties to a conference, with the United States General Pershing in the chair. The area in dispute was a little larger than Wales, and had a population of about 40,000. When Pershing's casting vote decided that a small strip in the extreme north was definitely

Peruvian territory, not being even in the plebiscite area, the Chileans walked out of the conference. Notwithstanding this development, Pershing, with the approval of the Peruvians, fixed the plebiscite for the following year. By the time the date of the plebiscite came round, there were so many complaints of Chilean coercion of the Tacna-Arica electorate that the United States cancelled the plebiscite. Then came a suggestion from the United States that the area should be given to Bolivia, money compensation being paid to both Chile and Peru. The contentious matter, now provocative of intense national feeling, simmered for another three years, but in 1929 a solution was found by direct negotiation between the two Governments, the territory being divided, Peru getting Tacna and Chile Arica, whilst Chile paid just over £1,000,000 to Peru. A clause in the treaty forbidding the construction of a railway through the ceded territory provoked a protest from Bolivia.

BOLIVIA

In the landlocked Republic of Bolivia, with its three million inhabitants, the people had never forgotten that before the Chilean war of 1879 the Bolivians held a seaport on the Pacific at Iquique. In 1920 the warlike President Gremo approached Chile for the cession of part of the Tacna-Arica territory, a move which infuriated the Peruvians, who claimed the district as of right. Gremo was prepared to fight Peru, but the Opposition preferred a Peruvian entente, and before the end of the year a revolution had expelled Gremo and put Saavedra in office. A revolt in 1924 was put down, but one in 1925 effected a change of government. In 1927 there was an unsuccessful Indian rebellion. For a few years Dr Siles ruled as dictator, but after his resignation as a result of rioting in 1930 Salamanca became President. A small Communist rising in the south was suppressed at the end of this year.

President Salamanca was deposed by army officers in 1934 for ordering a retreat before the Paraguayan army in the Chaco, the Vice-President Sorzano taking office. A further revolution in 1936 expelled Sorzano and set up Colonel Toro as President, the army officers declaring that the civilian politicians were too corrupt to govern. Toro adopted a semi-Socialist, semi-Fascist

policy, and membership of Trade Unions was made compulsory in 1936.

To the world at large Bolivia was of interest during these years on account of her war with Paraguay. The swampy and thinly-populated area known as the Great Chaco had been long in dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay, but the claims of Paraguay had been allowed to remain unchallenged for some years. In 1927 the question was raised again after Gremo's attempt to obtain a port on the Pacific had failed, since it was believed possible to find a deep-water port on the river Paraguay. Both Republics agreed to allow Argentina to attempt mediation, but not to pronounce an arbitral award, and the negotiations led to a deadlock. In 1928 Bolivia expelled the Paraguayan ambassador, and preparations were made for a military expedition into the Chaco. The League of Nations now intervened, and it was arranged that the whole question should be settled at the forthcoming Pan-American Conference. Again a deadlock ensued, and in 1931 diplomatic relations were again severed. The Bolivian troops on the old frontier began to move into the Chaco; fights took place, and the mob stormed the Houses of Parliament in La Paz howling for war with Paraguay. By the end of 1932 a state of real war existed, and the two armies fought bitterly for the swamps of the Chaco; Paraguay officially declared war before the close of the year. Neither side now listened to the League's proposals for arbitration. The Pan-American Conference at Monte Video in 1933 managed to bring about an armistice of a few weeks, but early in 1934 fighting started again.

In the Chaco fighting the Paraguayans, in spite of inferior numbers and poorer equipment, were generally successful, since they were more inured to the climate: in November 1934 they gained a notable victory, capturing 10,000 prisoners at Fort Ballivian. Bolivia now offered to accept the League's suggestions as regards mediation, but the victorious Paraguayans naturally refused to agree. A League embargo on the export of arms to both Republics was totally ineffective; though neither country manufactured armaments, both sides were well supplied from foreign sources, and in 1935 the arms ban was lifted as useless. Meanwhile the Paraguayan advance continued, and in 1935 the Paraguayan forces reached Charagua, more than two hundred miles into Bolivia. Bolivia now sued for an armistice, and a

neutral commission under the direction of the President of Argentina delimited the zones of occupation of the two armies. Both sides now agreed to demobilise, but there was great friction over the question of the release of prisoners, Paraguay having taken large numbers. Peace was signed in 1936, the final delimitation of the boundary being left to future negotiations. There could be no doubt that Bolivia had been thoroughly defeated in the war.

PERU

Peru, with its very scattered population of some five millions, entered under the dictatorial rule of President Leguia in 1919, and remained under his control—more or less—until 1930. His advent to office was typical of a South American Republic, for the figures of the voting were concealed by the previous President, Pardoe, and Leguia had to raise an armed revolution before his election was recognised. Four years later he amended the Constitution to enable him to enjoy a further term of office. He also granted a measure of devolution to the scattered communities of the distant provinces, local parliaments being established at Trujillo, Huanuco, and Arequipa. Political opposition was kept within bounds by frequent arrests, but in 1924 there was a small unsuccessful rebellion. Leguia at each successive election secured his own return as President, but in 1930, when Peru was beginning to suffer severely from the economic crisis, a general insurrection in Lima headed by military officers expelled him from office and appointed Colonel Cerro President. Martial law was declared in the districts round the capital, and the ex-president was sent to trial. The trial ended, however, in an acquittal, though he was still kept in prison. Cerro was ejected by a revolt in 1931, and a Socialist Government under de la Torre was installed in office. Then came another revolt, a battle between Socialists and anti-Socialists, in which the former won, and a presidential election; Cerro rather surprisingly obtained a majority.

The year 1932 saw an attempt to murder Cerro, a naval mutiny, a rebellion in the far north—followed by several executions, a Communist rising at Trujillo—put down after four days' desperate fighting, in which frightful atrocities were committed—and a final rebellion in the north.

Cerro was murdered in 1933, being succeeded by General Benarides; there was at once a rebellion in the north, which was suppressed, as was another revolt in 1934. At the election of 1936, in spite of the constitutional bar against a second term of office, he put up again as candidate, and when the result seemed to be going in favour of his opponent, Equiguren, Benarides stopped the count of votes and cancelled the whole election. Congress confirmed his second term of office, granted him dictatorial powers to govern by decree, and then obligingly dissolved itself.

Besides the long-standing trouble with Chile over Tacna-Arica,¹ Peru had another foreign imbroglio. A treaty with Colombia in 1924 had ceded to that Republic the territory north of the upper Amazon, but in 1932 a body of Peruvians seized the small town of Leticia, on the Colombian side of the river. Colombian troops were sent to expel them, and fighting began. The League of Nations intervened, and managed to persuade the combatants to refer the matter to its arbitration. The Brazilian Government was appointed arbitrator, and in 1934 the matter was peacefully settled.

ECUADOR

Ecuador, with a population of less than two millions, witnessed rebellions in 1925, 1928 and 1932. One President was expelled in 1925, and no less than three Presidents within a twelvemonth in 1932; during the latter year there was severe fighting in the streets of Quito, nearly four hundred persons being killed. In 1933 yet another President, Mera, was impeached by the Senate and expelled from office. A rising in the capital in 1935 was unsuccessful. A great blight of the cocoa crop caused considerable distress in 1925.

COLOMBIA

Alone of the South American Republics, the United States of Colombia has no rebellions to record during the post-war period. The country, which contains some eight million inhabitants, is

¹ See p. 310.

economically dominated by United States capital. In 1921 a treaty with the United States awarded Colombia £5,000,000 compensation for the severance of the Department of Panama from the Colombian Federation in 1903. In 1932 the Peruvian seizure of Leticia led to skirmishing, but the matter was successfully settled by the intervention of the League of Nations.¹

¹ See p. 314.

CHAPTER VI

The League of Nations

The idea of a federation of nations for the purpose of preserving peace was not a new one when President Wilson came to Europe. The advantages of the *Pax Romana* had preserved the ideal of a Holy Roman Empire, to which all the European nations should be obedient, all through the Middle Ages, whilst the claims of the Papacy to superiority over all kings and rulers were based, on the secular side, on a wish for international harmony and the avoidance of destructive wars. Idealist conceptions of a European League to avoid war were put forward at various times in the modern history of Europe, and after the long convulsion of the Napoleonic wars the Tsar Alexander of Russia secured the formation of the Holy Alliance for the avoidance of international friction, though its terms had been so vague and shadowy that it was no more than a pious expression of an ideal—or, as Castle-reagh said, “a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense”.

The peculiar conditions of the Great War, with its scientific slaughter of millions and its interference with the daily life of whole national populations, left the combatants—at any rate in the more civilised and prosperous countries—with a keen desire to prevent the recurrence of any such conflict. Before the League of Nations idea was broached, there was a general demand that this war should be “the war to end war”, the feeling being that the drastic punishment of the aggressors would teach an effective lesson to would-be disturbers of the world’s peace in future years.

The formulation of a definite plan for a League of Nations was due to the initiative of President Wilson, who held that all other problems of the peace settlement were small and unimportant compared with that of the prevention of future wars. Ably seconded by other statesmen, of whom Lord Robert Cecil and General Smuts were the most prominent, Wilson secured the inclusion in the peace treaties of the famous “Covenant” by which a permanent organisation was established to maintain the peace of the world. There were to be annual meetings of an international Assembly representing as many nations as possible;

a Council, responsible to that Assembly, was to meet at more frequent intervals; whilst a permanent staff of officials was to collect information and statistics and stand ready to apply a regular routine to matters arising out of international friction. The scheme included the extension of the pre-war Hague Court for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the elaboration of a number of international organisations for economic and social progress.

It is easy to riddle the constitution of the League with criticism. An Assembly in which every member state, irrespective of size or importance, had an equally weighty vote, so that Panama or Estonia had as much power in the voting as France or Italy, was hardly a satisfactory organ, but if votes were to be distributed according to relative importance the allotment of seats would have led to such arguments that the Assembly would probably have never been constituted at all. The recognition of the self-governing Dominions of the British Empire as separate members appeared, under such circumstances, to give unfair weight to one Power—and this was one of the main arguments used against the League in the United States—but it was obvious that for practical purposes the Dominions had most of the characteristics of independent states. The reservation of seats on the Council for the great Powers—at first a majority of those seats—was a counter-balance to the equalitarian constitution of the Assembly, but it gave the impression that the League was to be merely a continuation of the wartime coalition of the Allied Powers. The articles of the Covenant were somewhat vague, particularly in regard to the coercive measures to be adopted against aggressive states, but it was felt that too minute a regulation of procedure would be unwise before the League had got into working order.

The main thing was that the League of Nations had been brought into being, and that such an advance on the road to international co-operation had never been attained before. It remained to be seen whether the new organism would prove effective for its main purpose, the avoidance of war. At any rate it had the advantage of starting off with the enthusiastic backing of public opinion in many of the leading countries of the world. One great blow it received in its first stage of development; the United States, whose representatives at the peace conference had taken the lead in bringing the League into being, rejected the

scheme of the Covenant and refused to participate in the great experiment.

At the outset, twenty-nine states became members of the League, including six units of the British Empire. Six others joined when the constitution of the League had been drawn up, and within a few months seven more had come in. It was the intention of the founders that the ex-enemy states should be admitted to the League as soon as the other conditions of the peace treaties had been put into execution—particularly the disarmament clauses and the settlement of reparation payments, whilst Russia also—which at the time of the inauguration of the League in 1920 was convulsed by a great civil war—was expected to become a member as soon as her government became settled, though the triumph of the Bolshevik Government brought about a gulf between Russia and the majority of League members. It was also hoped that the United States would reconsider her decision to stand aloof. Since its foundation every state in the world has entered the League with the exception of the United States, Saudi Arabia and Egypt, though the newly liberated Egyptian state is to join as soon as the supplementary arrangements of the treaty with Great Britain are completed. Of the ex-enemy states, Austria and Bulgaria were admitted within the first few months, Hungary in 1922, Germany in 1926, and Turkey in 1932. Russia obtained admission in 1934, thirty-seven states voting in her favour and three against, seven others abstaining. Of the other states the latest additions were Mexico in 1931, Iraq in 1932, Afghanistan and Ecuador in 1934.

There were also secessions from the League, some of them of cardinal importance. At the opening meeting it appeared as though Argentina would not remain a member; annoyed at the postponement for a twelvemonth of a motion of theirs, the Argentine delegates walked out of the Assembly, but this action was not followed by actual secession, though the republic took no active part in League affairs until 1933. The small central American republic of Costa Rica dropped her membership in 1924 on the grounds of the expenses involved. When Germany entered the League in 1926, a dispute over the membership of the Council led to the secession of Brazil and Spain; Spain withdrew her resignation before the expiry of the two years which, by the terms of the Covenant, must elapse before a withdrawal can take

effect, but Brazil did not return. The Latin American states generally took little interest in League proceedings, and for some years Peru and Bolivia sent no delegates, but apart from Brazil, Costa Rica and Paraguay there were no actual secessions. Japan resigned in 1933 after her condemnation as guilty of aggressive warfare by forty-two votes to one—her own vote—in the assembly of that year. Germany resigned in 1933, after failing to obtain a speedy consent to her rearmament. Paraguay, dissatisfied with the League's actions during the dispute with Bolivia, resigned in 1935. The world-map of the League of Nations in 1937 showed eight blank spaces—the United States, Germany, Japan, Brazil, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Paraguay and Costa Rica.

The means devised for the prevention of war were of three kinds. Firstly, there was to be a permanent Court at the Hague to which states were to be encouraged to take their disputes. Secondly, steps were to be taken to promote disarmament, the aim being to reduce national armies to the size of mere police-forces, adequate to deal with possible rebellions within their own countries. Thirdly, by insisting in the Covenant that any state intending to make war upon another should notify the League and that an interval of three months should elapse before actual hostilities were begun, it was intended to discourage war in three ways—during the interval passions might cool and more amicable methods of settling differences might be adopted; the League would have three months in which to use all the weight of its persuasive force in favour of peace; and, since sudden attack on an unprepared enemy was one of the main factors in military victory, the fact that the enemy would have three months in which to prepare a defence would deter would-be aggressors from hopes of achieving their ends by sudden acts of violence. Should any state violate the "three months" clause, the members were pledged to establish an "economic blockade" of the aggressor, stopping all trade between the outlawed country and every other state—even with non-members of the League—and refusing all financial assistance by way of loans or credit. It was in addition left open to the League to apply "military sanctions", which might involve using force to suppress the defiant member. Yet another extension of these "sanctions" made it possible to apply them against states that were not members of the League.

The Permanent Court of International Justice was established

at the Hague in 1921. By what was called the "General Act" of 1928, states were invited to subscribe to one or more of three pledges: to submit all disputes to a League "Conciliation Court" before resorting to war, to submit all "legal" disputes—those arising out of the interpretation of treaties—to the Hague Court, and to submit all disputes to arbitrators selected equally by the interested parties, with a chairman appointed by the Hague Court, the decisions of the Courts in all these cases to be binding. To encourage reluctant members to make a beginning with this great scheme of conciliation and arbitration, states were allowed even to make "reservations" in their acceptance of any of the alternatives of the General Act, excluding particular types of dispute from their scope. The Hague Court was also available for casual disputes between members or non-members of the League, even if they had not signed any part of the General Act. The General Act was accepted in full by only four states—Norway, Denmark, Finland and Belgium; the first two pledges were taken by Sweden and Holland. Eighteen other states adopted the General Act with "reservations", whilst the acceptance of the Hague Court for legal disputes—known as the "Optional Clause"—was obtained from no less than forty-three. Outside the League scheme there have also been more than a hundred treaties between pairs of states providing for arbitration on some kinds of dispute, and forty of these treaties provide it for all disputes between the signatories.

Some fifty disputes have so far been submitted to the Hague Court. The decision that gave most cause for criticism was that which declared the projected customs-union between Germany and Austria contrary to previous treaties; the bad impression here was created, not so much by the actual verdict as by the fact that the opinions of the judges followed exactly the lines taken by the Governments of the countries from which they came. Other cases which commanded great interest were the Savoy customs-frontier dispute between France and Switzerland,¹ the Greenland dispute between Denmark and Norway,² the Magyar University Estates case of 1935 and the Greek schools case of the same year. The two latter cases arose from the treatment of minority populations in Czecho-Slovakia and Albania; in each case the ruling Government was restrained from acts of oppression against the

¹ See p. 82.

² See p. 207.

property and educational facilities of the minorities. It was noteworthy that the United States, whilst remaining aloof from the League as a whole, agreed to recognise and participate in the work of the Hague Court in 1929.

To initiate steps towards disarmament, the Assembly appointed what was called a "Temporary Mixed Commission" in 1921; this body, composed of civilians and officers of the armed forces of the Powers, was to draw up a scheme which would be submitted for discussion to the Assembly. After two years' work the Commission produced a Treaty of Mutual Assistance, the aim of which was to strengthen the protection afforded by the League to states that were the victims of aggression. Next year this was supplemented by what was termed the "Geneva Protocol", which attempted to make arbitration compulsory in all disputes. The intention was to make these two guarantees of freedom from foreign aggression the basis of a plan for disarmament, for which a special conference was to be summoned in 1925. But though the Geneva Protocol of 1924 was hailed by a unanimously favourable vote in the Assembly, and the Treaty of Mutual Assistance received the support of the majority of members, public opinion in many countries proved as hostile to the vote of their delegates in Geneva as was American opinion to the schemes of President Wilson. Since it was soon apparent that there would not be sufficient ratifications of the two treaties to make them effective, the proposed disarmament conference was abandoned. Instead, there was held a conference on the international trade in armaments, and as a result of the discussions a convention was signed by forty-four states abrogating the use of poison gas and disease germs in any war that they might conceivably undertake. The idea of a disarmament conference was not abandoned, however, and in the same year, 1925, the Assembly appointed a fresh Commission—called the "Preparatory Commission"—to draw up specific plans for such a meeting, whilst invitations were issued to the United States and Russia—both outside the League—to participate in the preparatory discussions.

The Temporary Mixed Commission had already considered several schemes for disarmament, the British proposal at that time being based on numbers of troops, the suggested proportions of the Great Powers being six units for France, four for Italy, three for Great Britain, and so on. The Preparatory Commission

took up the problem, and there was much conflict between those who wished to limit numbers of men and those who declared a limitation of war-material more essential. There were also rival schools within each group; some would limit standing armies only, others would limit trained reserves, whilst there was divergence on the question whether war-material should be limited according to quantities or to cost. As regards navies the main question was whether limitation should apply to total tonnage or to each separate class of vessel. Litvinov arrived with the Russian delegation in 1927, and surprised the world by demanding total disarmament. It was natural that each Power should approach the question with an eye steadily fixed on its own particular situation, and as the months went on it became evident that agreement even on elementary principles would be extremely hard to achieve. For two years the Preparatory Commission almost suspended its sessions. Then it was decided to draw up a draft treaty without any specific figures of limitation, and the disarmament conference was at last summoned to meet in 1932.

Sixty-four states were represented, including five non-members. Arthur Henderson, the British Cabinet Minister, was invited to act as chairman, and he accepted, but his position was somewhat weakened by the fact that before the conference got to work his party was out of office in Great Britain. The draft treaty laid before the conference proposed a limitation on numbers of men, length of service with the forces, numbers of ships, numbers of military aircraft, power of aircraft, financial expenditure on armaments, and many other items. Russia maintained her demand for complete disarmament; France put forward a scheme for an international army under the control of the League, an army that was to have a monopoly of bombing planes; Germany was concerned mainly with her claims for equality with France, whatever the eventual limits should be. By the end of the 1932 session the conference had managed to agree on a general prohibition of aerial bombing and a limitation of military aircraft, a limitation of big guns and tanks, and a confirmation of the 1925 convention on gas and disease germs. Germany proved the most fractious member of the conference, since she was impatient to obtain recognition of her right to escape from the invidious limitations of the Versailles Treaty. France stoutly maintained that German parity should come only after the settlement of the general dis-

armament treaty; Germany insisted on her parity claims being recognised first, and her delegates left the conference. A formula recognising the theory of German parity, though not yet releasing Germany from the Versailles limitations, was eventually accepted by Germany, and her delegates returned. Italy wanted to abolish battleships and submarines, bombing planes, tanks and heavy artillery. The United States suggested a flat reduction of one-third of all the existing armed forces of the world, whilst supporting the abolition of tanks, big guns and aerial bombing.

The 1933 session began with the production of a complete scheme, with figures for all nations, by the British Premier, Ramsay Macdonald. France produced a scheme for gradual reduction, with a preliminary period of four years' partial reduction and a bigger series of cuts afterwards. Britain and Italy approved of the general principle of this. Meanwhile the Nazis had risen to power in Germany, and, as might have been expected, Hitler soon renewed the demand for parity. Unable to obtain immediate release from the Versailles limitations, the German delegates left the conference for a second time, and did not return. At the same time Hitler made an independent offer to accept a general limitation on condition that Germany, France, Poland and Italy should all have equal armies, whilst as regards air force he even offered to accept half the French strength. France, however, refused to enter into this discussion at all, demanding that as a preliminary Germany should abandon her rearmament activities and observe the Treaty of Versailles. Italy then proposed a compromise; the armies of Europe should be stabilised at their present strengths, except the German army, which should be allowed to increase to 300,000 men. France strongly opposed this proposal. By this time, with Germany rearming and France declaring that she too must increase her armaments, the disarmament conference had ceased to feel any confidence in its power to effect anything of importance. Many of the delegates drifted away. During 1934 there was some desultory argument on the arms traffic and military budgets, but the main problem of disarmament remained quite unsolved, and after the adjournment of that year no more meetings were held. The Great Powers concentrated their energies on gigantic schemes of rearmament.

Outside the League the friendly negotiations between France and the United States had resulted in the Kellogg Pact to abjure

war, a treaty that was signed during 1927 and 1928 by no less than sixty-five states. Many Governments, however, added such diverse "interpretations" of the treaty—the word "reservations" was officially avoided—that it remained little more than a pious expression of an ideal. France was anxious to get the Kellogg Pact incorporated in the Covenant of the League, and reinforce it by the application of the Covenant sanctions. Britain was not unwilling for this proposal to be considered, but the other Powers did not wish to extend their commitments. Had this proposal been carried out, all wars, and not only those begun within the three months period, would have been forbidden, under penalty of sanctions. Yet another peace plan was that of a European federation within the framework of the League; this was proposed by Briand on behalf of France in 1930, but the general opinion was that it would be unwise thus to duplicate the work of the League. There had also been a partial disarmament in naval circles as a result of the Washington Treaty of 1922, when Great Britain accepted American parity in big ships and Japan accepted a ratio of three-fifths of the American standard. In 1927 a second naval conference was held for the purpose of limiting the numbers of small ships, but it was not successful; France and Italy refused to attend the conference at all, and when the British, Americans and Japanese met in Geneva, the two former Powers could not agree on the number of cruisers required to protect the trade-routes of the British Empire, and the meetings ended without any settlement of the question. At a third conference, held in London in 1930, France and Italy attended, whilst Great Britain made large concessions in the matter of cruisers. The Washington Treaty was extended for another five years, and the smaller craft were brought within the compass of limitation. France and Italy, however, failed to agree with the other three Powers, and the London Treaty was signed only by Britain, Japan and the United States. By the time the London arrangements came up for revision, in 1935, Japan had entered upon her expansionist policy, and at another London conference she demanded parity with Britain and America. Since this was refused her, Japan withdrew from the conference; the United States and Britain confirmed their mutual limitations with minor modifications. In 1935 Great Britain accepted Hitler's offer of a naval limitation pact with Germany, though under the Versailles Treaty Germany had

no right to more than a very small navy. By the 1935 agreement the German fleet was restricted to a maximum of 35 per cent of the British totals of vessels in all classes.

The Great War left an aftermath of petty conflicts that in some cases might be dignified by the name of wars, and the League applied itself at once to the task of bringing about a peaceful settlement of these disturbances—which at one time during the peace conference reached a total of twenty-three separate conflicts. The League took over the administration of the Saar Valley, which was to be given over to French economic control for fifteen years under the Versailles Treaty. The administration of Danzig was organised and a Commissioner installed. The plebiscite in Eupen and Malmedy was whittled down until it became a travesty of the original proposal, and the League lost credit over this affair. The Silesian problem was tackled, not very satisfactorily, but at any rate peace was restored to that region. The minorities in Poland and Rumania secured some protection from the League against their new rulers. A dispute between the new Republic of Finland and Sweden over the Aland Islands was settled peaceably. The League also did good service in the repatriation of prisoners of war and in combating typhus in eastern Europe.

The Vilna affair, which was brought before the League in 1920, came near enough to the situation envisaged by the authors of the "three months" clause to make many regard it as a test case for the efficiency of that instrument.¹ Vilna was occupied in the course of an existing war between Poland and Russia; the city was seized by an army that was nominally a local organisation and not a Polish force, whilst Lithuania was hardly yet an established state at all. Nevertheless, the seizure was in effect a Polish act of aggression, and it was suggested in some quarters that the Poles should be given the alternative of restoring the occupied territory to Lithuania or of being subjected to an economic blockade. The Council of the League arranged a plebiscite in the disputed area, but did not proceed with it, and after an attempt to effect a conciliation—undertaken by Hymans, the Belgian Foreign Minister—the League washed its hands of the business. Vilna remained in Polish hands, and the critics of the League—of whom there were already many—denounced its failure to resist Polish aggression as a lamentable show of incapacity and weakness which would

¹ See p. 161.

encourage other states to defy its decisions. In the case of the Albanian frontier, in 1921, however, the invasion of disputed territory by Jugoslav troops was met by a definite threat of "sanctions", and the Jugoslavs withdrew their troops at once. An aftermath of the Vilna affair was the seizure of Memel by the Lithuanians in 1923, and in view of the League's failure to restore Vilna to Lithuania no serious effort was made to drive the invaders out of Memel. A frontier dispute between Poland and Czechoslovakia in the same year was settled amicably.

A more serious blow to the prestige of the League than the Vilna and Memel affairs was the Corfu question of 1923.¹ Here was a great Power committing an open act of aggression against a small state, both being members of the League. Many regarded this case as the acid test of the efficacy of the League for its major purpose of the prevention of war. Mussolini, however, defied the League, and after some friction the Council handed the matter over to the Conference of Ambassadors—a continuation of the former Supreme Allied Council—for settlement. Greece was forced to pay heavily for the murder of the Italian officers, but no penalty was imposed on Italy for having bombarded Corfu. Defenders of the League argued that Corfu was a mere "incident" and not a war; besides, Greece had agreed to place the matter in the hands of the Conference of Ambassadors instead of the League Council. Nevertheless a widespread feeling remained that the League had shirked its responsibilities and was afraid to take serious action against a great Power, and it was felt that the Italian use of "reeking tube and iron shard" should have been punished.

In 1925 came the Greco-Bulgarian frontier affair, when, as the result of a shooting affray between sentry-parties, a Greek army invaded Bulgaria. Here vigorous action was taken, and by a threat of sanctions even stronger than that addressed to Jugoslavia in 1921, Greece was compelled to withdraw her troops and pay compensation for damage done. This success with a minor state somewhat restored the prestige that had been lost over Corfu, and a large body of world opinion still put faith in the ultimate triumph of League control. For the next seven years the League stood high in the esteem of statesmen, and the successful intervention in the Liberian civil war in Africa in 1932, when the

¹ See p. 102.

League Commissioner, Dr Mackenzie, secured the restoration of peace and the disarming of twenty tribes, was another piece of good work.

Meanwhile reformers were at work trying to strengthen the League by an extension of the provisions for the prevention of war. The Temporary Mixed Commission incorporated in its draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923 a proposal empowering the League to pronounce judgment on the responsibility for any outbreak of actual warfare between two or more states and laying upon all its members the duty of fighting the state that had thus been declared the aggressor. France and the states of the Little Entente accepted this proposal, but Great Britain and the British Dominions refused to undertake the new responsibility, and after the scheme had been opposed on similar lines by other states—notably by the Scandinavian countries and Holland—it was dropped. Next year came the Geneva Protocol, the effect of which would be to make all wars illegal under international law; the adoption of the Protocol was to be followed, not by an increase of sanctions but by general disarmament. This scheme too, though hailed with enthusiasm in the Assembly and accepted by a unanimous vote, failed to obtain more than a few ratifications from the member states. The opposition was again strongest in Great Britain and the Dominions, the criticism being here directed mainly against the likelihood that compulsory arbitration on international quarrels would tend to involve domestic problems, particularly racial questions, the specific case being that of Japanese immigration. One step towards the strengthening of sanctions was taken in 1930, when the Assembly approved a convention by which members were invited to bind themselves to afford financial aid to such states as were the victims of aggressive warfare. The pledge was, however, largely nullified by its being made conditional on a reduction of armaments on the part of the state seeking aid—and no country felt like disarming at that moment.

In 1931 a challenge even greater than that thrown down by Mussolini in 1923 was offered to the League. Japan sent a large army to Manchuria and began a serious war against China, covering her action by protests at Geneva to the effect that the affair was a mere "police" measure. The appeal of China was accepted by the Council, which called on Japan to withdraw her troops and evacuate the area beyond the railway zone of

Manchuria, into which a treaty of 1905 allowed Japanese garrisons to penetrate. Though the League was strengthened by the appearance of an American representative as "observer" at the Council, considerable hesitation was shown in dealing with so powerful a state as Japan. The Lytton Commission was sent out to "study the situation on the spot". The Commission roundly condemned Japan, and it was obvious by the end of 1932 that Japan had conquered Manchuria by war; nevertheless the League of Nations professed to accept the Japanese thesis that there had been no actual "war", and the only "penalty" inflicted on Japan was that the League refused to recognise the new puppet-state of Manchu Kuo. Without a lead from the League, no nation wished to interfere in this far eastern conflict. Britain imposed an embargo on the export of arms to either belligerent, but as no other country followed suit the prohibition was withdrawn. Even that measure of censure applied by the League provoked indignation in Japan, who withdrew from the League in 1932.

In 1933 another war broke out without the three months notice being given. Paraguay was invading Bolivia over the Chaco dispute. A League Commission sent out to effect an amicable agreement proved powerless. Again no attempt was made to impose sanctions, though an embargo was declared on the export of arms to the combatants—with a reservation for "existing contracts". In 1935 the ban was limited to Paraguay. The war was fought out in total disregard of the League, and Paraguay resigned her membership. In the same year Colombia appealed to the League for help against Peru, which had enforced its claims to the town of Leticia by military invasion. There was talk of sanctions here, but the Peruvians were not prepared for a big upheaval over so small a matter as the town of Leticia, and both sides agreed to League arbitration, which settled the matter peaceably in the following year. An equally satisfactory result was obtained in the dispute between Jugoslavia and Hungary following the murder of King Alexander; the League persuaded the disputants to accept a formula which, though admitting that Jugoslav rebels had used Hungarian territory as a base, exonerated the Magyar Government from the intention of harming Jugoslavia. The settlement of the dispute between Persia and Britain over the rights of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company in 1933 was also to the credit of the League.

The sessions of the disarmament conference produced several plans for the strengthening of the powers of the League, particularly the French plan of 1933, which provided for an international police-force in the shape of a League Army, which was to possess control over "dumps" of munitions of war collected for its use in the various countries. Nothing came of this proposal. At the end of the year 1933 Mussolini approached the question of the League's powers from another angle, suggesting that experience had shown the inadequacy of the system established in 1919 and proposing a general revision of the terms of the Covenant.

In 1935 came the Abyssinian crisis. Both Italy and Abyssinia put their cases in regard to the Wal-Wal incident before the League at the end of 1934, and the League conducted an inquiry which resulted in a general exoneration of both Governments, whilst it was proposed that a League Commission should be appointed to introduce reforms into Ethiopia. Then came the news that the Italian armies had crossed the frontier in force, and that an advance on Addis Ababa had been initiated. Abyssinia appealed to the League under the "three months" article. The Council declared Italy to be guilty of aggressive warfare, and the decision was confirmed by the Assembly, only Italy and her allies—Austria, Hungary, and Albania—dissenting. There was this time no attempt to dismiss the matter as a "police operation" or to send out a Commission to study the situation on the spot; and for the first time "sanctions" became a practical proposition. A Committee of fifty-two was set up to outline the sanctions scheme, and this appointed a smaller committee of eighteen members. As a result of this committee's report, the Assembly took the step of imposing sanctions, though on a scale far more limited than had been anticipated by the framers of the Covenant. Instead of a complete economic blockade, the ban extended only to armaments, and the "key-materials" of warfare; though the ingredients of high explosives were forbidden, petrol—an essential to the movement of a modern army—was left free. Nor were any steps taken to enforce such blockade as there was against non-member states, or for that matter against member states that wished to sell to Italy. All importation of goods from Italy was forbidden, and so was the grant of loans and credit. "Sanctions" came into operation on 18 November 1935.

Altogether fifty-two states applied the arms embargo and the

financial sanctions, and all but one of these applied the embargo to the "key-imports". At the same time forty-six states entered into a pact for mutual aid in meeting losses imposed on their traders as a result of the interruption to commerce. These limited sanctions, though harassing to Italy and involving much inconvenience, did not interfere with her capacity to carry through the Abyssinian campaign, and she announced that any attempt to impose a complete blockade or to make it effective by naval patrols would be met by open war against such states as tried to enforce it. The League did not take up this challenge. The war ended in the conquest of Abyssinia, and in July 1936 sanctions were "called off"; the only serious protest against this abandonment of penal measures came from the South African delegates. As a climax to the affair the Italian delegates walked out of the Assembly as a protest against its admitting the Abyssinian representatives to the discussions. The Assembly however, refused to expel the delegation from the country that had put its trust in the League only to be conquered, and decided that "for this session" they could remain, leaving the future of the Ethiopian representation undecided. By 1937 the exiled Abyssinian Government had decided that further representation at Geneva would be useless, and so the problem of their presence did not arise.

Many times before had the League been assailed with criticism and its previous failures had each been followed by a wave of reaction against the faith that ordinary people were inclined to put in the great experiment, but the failure in the Abyssinian crisis caused so great a depression among the League's supporters that it was widely felt that its influence was gone for good. The three federated Central American republics—Guatemala, Nicaragua and Honduras—handed in notice of resignation after the withdrawal of sanctions. The disarmament conference had faded into space, and when its chairman, Arthur Henderson, died, in 1935, it was not considered necessary to select anyone to succeed him, since it was doubtful if the conference would ever meet again. The Great Powers were rearming at a furious rate, including Germany, who had torn up the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. The League uttered a protest against this "unilateral denunciation of treaties" but contented itself with that. It seemed almost a farce when in 1936 a committee was appointed to consider anew the prospects of disarmament. Those

who still had faith in the idea of collective security were demanding a new Covenant, since the old one had proved so unsatisfactory, but hosts of people had lost all faith whatsoever in an ideal that had attempted to subordinate national selfishness to the wider interests of humanity.

Most people judged the League on its success or failure as a peacemaker, but its activities included a vast range of work in other fields than diplomacy. It proved of cardinal importance in extending financial aid to the war-exhausted nations of eastern Europe; in 1922 Austria was saved from chaos by the issue of the League loan, which incidentally entailed the supervision of Austrian state finances until 1925. A second loan on similar terms was issued to help Hungary in 1923. When a million Greek refugees crossed the Aegean from Turkey after the Greco-Turkish war, adding 20 per cent to the former population of Greece, the League stepped in with financial and administrative assistance which settled the entire crowd on the land during the years 1923 to 1926. A similar scheme was applied to Bulgaria in 1927. Estonia and Danzig were two small states that received loans from the League during 1926, and a loan was offered to the negro republic of Liberia in 1934, though no agreement could be reached on the subject of League supervision of finances.

In the realm of public health, the Health Committee and its numerous sub-committees—on which representatives of the United States and of Russia before her entry to the League were to be found—carried out useful research work in connection with cancer, tuberculosis, sleeping-sickness, malaria and leprosy, and spread its information among the member states. Its epidemiological bureau for the study of tropical diseases was established at Singapore; an intensive study of sleeping-sickness was made at its centre at Entebbe in Uganda. An important leprosy conference was held at Rio de Janeiro in 1933. Practical help was given to the Governments of Greece, China and Bolivia in the reorganisation of their public health services on modern lines in 1930 and 1931. Conventions were drawn up to restrict the production and sale of opium and other dangerous drugs, the opium convention obtaining the necessary number of ratifications to bring it into force by 1928, though its administration was extremely difficult owing to the powerful vested interests in this lucrative traffic. A second convention imposing quotas of production on

each country was adopted in 1931. Among the numerous minor activities of the Health department were an inquiry into the sanitation of the Levant ports, and the institution of instruction courses for public health officers of all nations.

Great efforts were made by the League to suppress the remnants of slavery in various parts of the world, as well as the forced labour which verged on slavery. The anti-slavery convention was adopted in 1926, the convention regarding forced labour in 1930. The difficulties of enforcing the anti-slavery convention in remote areas led to the establishment of a permanent anti-slavery commission in 1930, against the strong opposition of Abyssinia. In 1933 a convention imposed uniform restrictions on the "white slave" traffic, following on a comprehensive inquiry and report on this subject in 1927.

An Economic Commission set up a permanent organisation for the collection of statistics and the drafting of conventions in 1928, whilst at the same time a beginning was made with the codification of international law. Commercial and customs nomenclature was co-ordinated throughout the world. The "World Economic Survey" published as a commentary on the great economic crisis in 1932 was a magnificent contribution to the efforts for recovery and led up to a demand for general reduction of tariffs. Already in 1927 a world economic conference had been held in Geneva, but its recommendations in this direction had fallen upon deaf ears, and little progress was made in tariff reduction as the result of a second world economic conference in London held in 1933. Nationalist selfishness appeared as tough an obstacle to world agreement in the economic as in the political sphere. Special economic inquiries were conducted by the League in connection with the coal trade, the hop trade, the gold standard, and other branches of commerce. Meanwhile a Transport Commission drew up model regulations for navigable rivers, buoyage and coast-lighting, and even concerned itself with smoothing the passage of travellers by regulations regarding trans-frontier charabancs and the issue of passports. Among many other activities of the League may be mentioned the publication in 1926 of a splendid bibliography of scientific works, by the Committee of Intellectual Co-operation, and the holding of a congress on "The Cinema in Education" in Rome in 1934.

The International Labour Organisation—in Britain often re-

ferred to as the I.L.O.—though part of the League of Nations machinery, has from the first been run as an independent body, and the United States has been an active participant in its work. Each state sends representatives of the Government, the employers' organisations and the workers' unions. A Labour Charter, drawn up with general consent, accepted certain principles on which world industry and commerce should be conducted, including the right of association for both employers and employed, a minimum wage and a restriction of working hours, a weekly rest-day, prohibition of child labour, equal pay for men and women doing the same work, and efficient inspection of working conditions. The I.L.O. continued the work of the Washington Conference on the conditions of labour held in 1919, but on a permanent basis. Many international conventions on conditions of labour have been adopted, the total number of separate ratifications being in the neighbourhood of 700. Among the fifty or sixty conventions open for adoption by any state the most noteworthy of recent years have been the forty-hour week convention of 1935, the "Seaman's Charter" of 1936 regulating conditions of work on board ship, and the convention for holidays with pay adopted also in 1936.

All these "subsidiary" activities of the League attracted little notice in the Press of the world, and people generally judged it on its record in the maintenance of peace. In 1936 the reputation of the League had reached a very low ebb. Few even of its keenest supporters were not depressed by the failure of the sanctions episode. Some saw salvation in a new Covenant, others in a reversion to what was termed "power-politics", the Great Powers of the world making their own treaties for the adjustment of disputes and trusting to luck for the avoidance of another outbreak of hostilities. Yet on a broad view there is much to be said for the progress made in less than twenty years. It must be remembered that the experiment of a permanent organisation for collective security had never been tried before in the history of the world, and that such Leagues as had previously existed covered only small portions of the earth's surface. Governments representing a vast majority of the inhabitants of the globe were now in constant touch with one another in what was almost a "Parliament of Man", and if some of the major problems had proved too difficult for the League to solve in a satisfactory manner,

many minor ones had been settled to the general satisfaction. How far these minor problems would have been solved by the old methods of inter-state diplomacy is, of course, impossible to calculate, but at least such disputes as that between Jugoslavia and Albania in 1921 and still more that between Greece and Bulgaria in 1925 would almost certainly have led to war had it not been for the action of the League. The intervention of the League in the Mosul dispute and in the minorities question of Iraq also proved extremely useful, and probably avoided much slaughter. It took many centuries for the ideals of communal justice and peaceful litigation to establish themselves as normal factors in the life of the separate states; it was too much to expect that the "old Adam" of selfishness could be shackled in international politics within a few years of the establishment of the conferences at Geneva. The mere fact that international disputes are argued before a world-assembly, the majority of whose members are neutral and also anxious to preserve the peace, is a factor tending to check the hasty drawing of swords, even though the League occupies the position rather of the Court Missionary than of the Policeman. In the long run, the victory of the League over nationalist defiance depends on effective coercive powers, and the French proposals for a League army adequate to suppress armed resistance to the decisions of Geneva are the most satisfactory from a logical point of view. Even the most broad-minded nations, however, are not yet prepared to sacrifice their wills to an organism of which they form only a small part. One of the greatest weaknesses of the League has always been the absence of one or more of the great nations from its deliberations: for long it worked without the participation of Russia and the United States in its efforts; at present it lacks the support of the United States, Germany, Italy and Japan. Should a new Covenant bring in these Great Powers to the world-confederation, the prospects of the League of Nations as a promoter of peace and prosperity should be far greater than they have hitherto been.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anything approaching a complete bibliography of so large a subject as the affairs of foreign countries since the Great War would require a volume to itself. For the student approaching this subject—and still more for the general reader—guidance in the selection of books is needed, rather than a comprehensive list. The principles on which the following short selection has been compiled are as follows:

(a) Events move so rapidly nowadays that most books on this subject, whilst not becoming exactly "obsolete", after a few years present gaps which the reader would be glad to find filled in. The books mentioned here have all been published during the 1930's, and thus bring the story fairly closely up to date.

(b) Except for purposes of very detailed study, the reader usually requires works of an easy and attractive style. Most of the undermentioned works can be read with full appreciation by those who have given little time to previous detailed study of the topics treated.

(c) The list has been limited in numbers to a few outstanding books on the most important political developments. It has been with great reluctance that some excellent works have been omitted, but the wish to avoid overburdening the student by an "embarras de richesses" has imposed somewhat drastic limits.

Very full lists of works relating to each country are accessible in *The Statesman's Year-Book*, whilst the bibliographies published from time to time by the Library Association, and obtainable at most Public Libraries, contain a further selection.

GENERAL

The Treaty of Versailles and After. Lord Riddell and others. 1935.
Peacemaking. H. Nicolson. 1933.
The Twilight of Treaties. Y. M. Goblet. 1936.
Economic Consequences of the Great War. A. L. Bowley. 1936.
International Relations since the Peace Treaties. E. H. Carr. 1937.
The Post-war World. J. H. Jackson. 1935.
Europe and Europeans. C. Sforza. 1936.
Inside Europe. J. Gunther. 1936.
Europe in Crisis. R. B. Mowat. 1936.
Fear Came on Europe. J. I. Whitaker. 1937.
Walks and Talks Abroad. Sir A. Wilson. 1936.
Europe in Arms. B. H. L. Hart. 1937.

Bibliography

CENTRAL EUROPE

History of the German Republic. A. Rosenberg. 1936.
The Fall of the German Republic. R. T. Clark. 1935.
The Tragedy of a Nation. Prince H. Loewenstein. 1934.
History of National Socialism. K. Heiden. 1934.
Hitler; a Biography. K. Heiden. 1936.
Germany to-day and to-morrow. C. Cunningham. 1936.
Hitler over Europe? E. Henri. 1934.
Hitler the Pawn. R. Olden. 1936.
Germany Puts the Clock Back. E. A. Mowrer. 1933. (Republished 1938
 with supplementary chapter.)
Nazi Germany Explained. V. Bartlett. 1933.
Modern Austria. C. Hamilton. 1933.
Hungary and her Successors. C. A. Macartney. 1937.
Watch Czechoslovakia. R. Freund. 1937.

WESTERN EUROPE

France Faces the Future. R. Fox. 1936.
France to-day and the People's Front. M. Thoraz. 1936.
French Parties and Politics. R. H. Soltau. 1930.
Post-war France. P. Vaucher. 1934.
Modern Italy. C. Hamilton. 1935.
Mussolini's Italy. H. Finer. 1935.
Fascist Italy. H. Vivian. 1936.
Sawdust Caesar. G. Seldes. 1936.
The Spanish Tragedy. E. A. Peers. 1936.
Spain in Revolt. H. Gannes and T. Repard. 1936.
Spanish Rehearsal. A. Lunn. 1937.
Conflict in Spain, 1920-1937. G. M. Godden. 1937.

EASTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE

Yugoslavia. G. Ellison. 1935.
Yugoslavia. S. T. Patterson. 1936.
King Zog's Albania. J. Swire. 1937.
Contemporary Roumania and her problems. J. S. Rousek. 1932.
Politics and Political Parties in Roumania. J. Clerk. 1936.
The Poland of Pilsudski. R. Machray. 1936.
The Great Offensive (Russia). M. Hindus. 1933.
Soviet Communism; a New Civilisation? S. and B. Webb. 1935.
Modern Russia. C. Hamilton. 1934.
Russia's Iron Age. W. H. Chamberlin. 1935.

I Search for Truth in Russia. Sir W. Citrine. 1936.
Moscow admits a Critic. Sir B. Pares. 1936.
Twenty Years After (Russia). H. Lee. 1937.
Red Eagle. D. Wheatley. 1937.
Finland; the New Nation. A. Rothery. 1936.
The Baltic States. H. Spaull. 1931.
Sweden; the Middle Way. M. W. Childs. 1936.

ASIA AND AFRICA

Turkey. T. L. Jarman. 1935.
The Making of Modern Turkey. Sir H. Luke. 1936.
The Arabs. B. Thomas. 1937.
Ibn Saud. K. Williams. 1933.
The Making of Modern Iraq. H. A. Foster. 1936.
Mesopotamia: the Last Phase. A. H. Burne. 1936.
China; the Pity of it. J. O. P. Bland. 1932.
China's Millions. A. L. Strong. 1936.
The Drama of the Pacific. R. V. Bodley. 1935.
Behind the Face of Japan. U. Close. 1935.
The Far East in World Politics. G. F. Hudson. 1937.
Militarism and Foreign Policy in Japan. E. Causton. 1936.
Eyes on Japan. V. A. Yakhontoff. 1937.
Morocco at the Parting of the Ways. E. F. Cruickshank. 1935.

AMERICA

Party Government in the United States. J. W. Davis. 1930.
The Hoover Administration. W. S. Myers and W. G. Newton. 1936.
The National Recovery Administration. L. S. Lyon and others. 1935.
People and Politics of Latin America. M. W. Williams. 1931.
Eight Republics in Search of a Future. R. Forbes. 1933.
Modern South America. C. W. Domeville-Fife. 1932.
The Republics of South America. P. Guedalla and others. 1937.
Tyrant of the Andes (Venezuela). T. Rourke. 1937.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The League in our Time. K. Gibberd. 1933.
The League Fiasco. V. Margueritte. 1936.
The Future of the League of Nations. Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1936.

INDEX

Aachen, 10
Abd el Krim, 114, 264-6
Abdullah, Emir, 224
Abyssinia, 104-8, 329-31
Action Française, 64-8
Addis Ababa, 107
Adowa, 104, 106-7
Afghanistan, 234-5
Afoun-Karahissar, 138
Agadir, 265
Aguinaldo, 282
Ahmad Ali, 235
Ahmad of Persia, 231-2
Ahmad Pasha, 260
Akaba, 224
Aland Islands, 202
Alaouites, 218, 220
Albania, 135-7
Albert, Archduke, 54
Albert of Belgium, 76
Alcala-Zamora, 115-19
Alessandri, 309-10
Alexander of Greece, 139-40
Alexander of Yugoslavia, 133-4
Alexandretta, 217, 220
Alfonso XIII, 111-16
Allenby, Lord, 258-60
Allenstein, xiii, 13, 160
Almeria, 123
Alsace-Lorraine, xv, 60, 63
Alvear, 308-9
Amanullah, 234-5
Amoy, 243
Anarchists, 112, 117
Andrassy, 49
Anglo-Persian Oil Co., 233, 328
Angola, 125-6
Angora, 138, 214-15
Anschluss, 32, 36-40, 45-6
Anual, 114, 265
Aosta, Duke of, 54
Arabia, 225-6
Archangel expedition, 168-70
Arcos, 194
Argentina, 306-9
Argetoianu, 154
Armenia, 171-3, 213
Assyrian Christians, 229-30
Astrid, Queen, 77
Austria, 6, 37-47
Aventine Secession, 95
Averescu, 153
Awakening Hungarians, 51
Azaña, 116
Azerbaijan, 171-3
Aznar, 116-17, 119
Badoglio, 104, 107
Bakhtiari, 233
Balahovitch, 170
Baldwin, Stanley, 107
Balearic Isles, 109, 119
Balfour Declaration, 221
Balilla, 97, 99
Balkan Pact, 145, 157
Baltic Pact, 197
Barosh, 85
Barrios, 117
Bartel, 163
Basle Canton, 84
Basques, 112, 117
Batavia, 80
Battle of the Grain, 98, 101
Batum, 213
Bauer, 8
Bavaria, 4-5, 15-16, 22
Bayonne Bonds, 66
Belgium, 73-7
Benedict XV, Pope, 93
Benes, 57
Berenguer, 114-15, 265
Bessarabia, 152, 156, 171
Bethlen, 50-1, 54
Big Five, x
Bilbao, 112, 117, 121
Bissolati, 87
Black, Senator, 292
Bloc National, 61-3
Blue Shirts, 127
Blum, 63, 67-9, 73
Bolivia, 311-3, 331
Bolsheviks (Russia), 167-96
Bonar Law, 9
Bonomi, 87

Borah, Senator, 279
 Boris of Bulgaria, 148-50
 Borodin, 240
 Bosnia, xiv
 Boxer Indemnity, 250
 Branting, 209
 Bratianu Brothers, 152-4
 Braun, 16-17
 Brazil, 303-5
 Briand, 62, 64, 72
 Brownshirts, 20-8
 Brüning, 19-20
 Brusa, 138
 Budenny, 159
 Bukharin, 184, 192
 Bulgaria, 144-51
 Buresch, 41
 Burgenland, 38, 40
 Caballero, 121
 Caillaux, 62-3
 Caliphate, 214-15, 226
 Calles, 296-300
 Camelots du Roi, 67
 Cameroons, xv
 Canary Isles, 109, 119
 Canton, 245
 Capone, Al, 275
 Cardenas, 300
 Carinthia, 38, 129
 Carlists, 111
 Carmona, 126-7
 Carol of Rumania, 154-7
 Carranza, 294-6
 Cartel des Gauches, 63-5
 Catalonia, 112, 116-19, 121
 Catholic Action, 97
 Caviglia, General, 85
 Central Lithuania, 161-2
 Cerro, 313-14
 Chaco, 305-6, 311-13, 328
 Chahar, 247-8
 Chanak, 213
 Chang Hsueh-Liang, 241-6, 249
 Chang Tso-Lin, 239-41, 245-6, 249
 Chapaprieto, 119
 Charles of Habsburg, 49, 58
 Charles of Hesse, 202
 Chautemps, 65, 69
 Chiang Kai-Shek, 240-4, 249
 Chile, 309-11
 China, 236-51
 Chita, 171
 Christian X of Denmark, 205
 Cilicia, 213
 Clemenceau, xii, xvi, 61
 Colombia, 314-15
 Comintern, 188, 193-4
 Confédération Gén. du Travail, 63, 68
 Congo Free State, 75
 Constantine of Greece, 139-41
 Constantinople, 139, 212
 Coolidge, 277
 Corfu, 102, 146, 326
 Costa Rica, 301, 318
 Coughlin, Father, 289
 Coundouriotis, 140-2
 Covenant, xv
 Cristeros, 298
 Croats, 128-35
 Croix de Feu, 67-8
 Cuba, 280, 293, 301-2
 Cuno, 14-15
 Curaçao, 302
 Curzon Line, 158-60
 Cuza, 157
 Cyprus, 145
 Cyrenaica, 104
 Czecho-Slovakia, 55-9
 Da Costa, 125
 Dalmatia, xiii, 85, 129
 Damascus, 219
 D'Annunzio, 85, 89-90
 Danzig, 37, 165
 Daranyi, 53
 Dardanelles, 213
 Darfur, 263
 Daszynski, 158
 Daudet, 64-5
 Daunig, 8
 Dawes Plan, 11-12, 14-16
 Dayton, Tennessee, 276
 De Bono, 94, 107
 Degrelle, 76
 De Jouvenel, 219
 De La Roque, 68
 De Man, 76
 Demerdjis, 144
 Denikin, 160-70
 Denmark, 205-6
 Dervishes, 216
 Deschanel, 61

Dillinger, John, 275
 Dimitroff, 147
 Dinkas, 263
 Djerjinsky, 185
 Dodecanese, 145
 Dollfuss, 42-4
 Doorn, 77
 Dopolavoro, 100
 Dorpat Treaty, 202
 Doumer, 61
 Doumergue, 61, 66
 Drashkovitch, 131
 Drexler, 22
 Duca, 156
 Düsseldorf, 9
 Dutch East Indies, 79-80

East Prussia Relief, 21
 Ebert, 6, 16
 Ecuador, 314
 Egypt, 257-64
 Einstein, 36
 Eisner, 4-5
 Ekman, 210
 El Paso, 281
 Enderta, 107
 Entebbe, 331
 Erzberger, 7, 17
 Eskishehr, 138
 Estella, Marquis (*see* Primo de Rivera, Michael)
 Estonia, 197, 200-1
 Eupen and Malmedy, xiii, 13, 73
 Evans, Mrs, 296

Facta, 87, 91
 Fajnor, 56
 Farouk of Egypt, 263
 Fascisti, 89-110
 Fatherland Front, 44, 46
 Faulhaber, 34
 Fehrenbach, 8, 14
 Feisal, Emir, 218, 225, 227-30
 Feng Yu-Hsiang, 239-41
 Ferdinand of Bulgaria, 147
 Ferdinand of Rumania, 155
 Fey, 42, 44
 Finland, 201-5
 Fiume, 54, 85, 103, 129
 Five Year Plans (Russia), 186-7
 Flandin, 66
 Flemings, 74

Foch, xii, 2
 Fonjallaz, 83
 Ford, Henry, 270
 Fordney-McCumber Tariff, 276
 Forty Families, 309
 Fourteen Points, xii, 3
 France, 60-73
 Franck, 76
 Franco (Paraguay), 305
 Franco (Spain), 119-22
 Frank, Dr, 45
 Frankfort, 8
 Frick, 21
 Friedrich, 48, 51
 Fuad of Egypt, 259-63

Garbai, 48
 Gareis, 17
 Gdynia, 37, 165
 Geneva, xvi
 Geneva Canton, 83
 Geneva Protocol, 321
 Gentleman's Agreement (Japan), 279
 George II of Greece, 140-4
 Georgia, 177-3, 213
 German East Africa, xv
 German South-west Africa, xv
 Germany, 1-37
 Gessler, 18
 Ghazi of Iraq, 230-1
 Ghazni, 235
 Ghent University, 74-5
 Gheorgieff, 150
 Gihon, 121
 Gilbert, Parker, 11-12
 Giolitti, 119, 121
 Giral, 119, 121
 Gjoni, Marka, 136
 Gleichhaltung, 30
 Göbbels, 58
 Goded, 119
 Gömbös, 51-4
 Gomez (of Venezuela), 302-3
 Gondar, 108
 Göring, 20-1, 27, 31
 Gounaris, 141
 Gouraud, 219
 Grand Liban, 218-20
 Graziani, 104, 107
 Greece, 137-46
 Green, William, 292
 Greenland, 207

Gremo, 311-12
 Gringoire, 68
 Gröner, 18
 Guatemala, 301, 330
 Guerra, Sanchez, 115
 Gustavus of Sweden, 211

 Habibullah, 234-5
 Habsburgs, 47-8, 55, 58, 128
 Hague Agreement, 1930, 46
 Hague Court, 319-21
 Haifa, 222, 224
 Haile Selassie, 105, 107-8
 Haiti, 280-1
 Hamaguchi, 254
 Hankow, 241
 Hansson, 210
 Hara, 253-4
 Harding, 270, 276
 Harrington, 213
 Harrison, Burton, 282
 Hedjaz, 225-6
 Heimwehr, 40-6
 Helen of Greece, 155
 Henderson, Arthur, 322, 330
 Henne, 83
 Herriot, 11, 63-5
 Hilmy, Abbas, 263
 Himmler, 34
 Hindenburg, 17-21, 24, 29
 Hirohito of Japan, 253
 Hirota, 255
 Hitler, 16, 21-36
 Hitler Youth, 24, 33
 Hoare, Sir Samuel, 107
 Hoffmann, 5
 Holland (*see* Netherlands)
 Honduras, 301, 330
 Hong Kong, 250
 Hoover, 12, 277, 281-5
 Hopei, 247-8
 Horthy, 49, 55
 Huerta, 294-8
 Huesca, 120
 Hugenberg, 24
 Hungary, 47-55
 Hussein of Egypt, 259
 Hussein of Hedjaz, 218, 224-6
 Hymans, 161

 Ibañez, 114
 Iceland, 206-7

Index

I.L.O., 332-3
 Integralists, 305
 Inukai, 255
 Iran (*see* Persia)
 Iraq, 227-31
 Irigoyen, 307-8
 Iron Guard, 156
 Iron Wolf, 199
 Irun, 120
 Istiqlal, 222
 Istituto Mobiliare, 98
 Italy, 84-110

 Jacob, Bernard, 82
 Japan, 251-7
 Jarres, 16-17
 Java, 80
 Javorzina, 58
 Jebel Druze, 218-20
 Jeddah, 226
 Jiminez, 298
 Johnson, Senator, 293
 Jorga, 154, 156
 Joseph, Archduke, 48
 Juarez, 181
 Jubaland, 104
 Jugoslavia, 128-35
 Justo, 308

 Kahr, 15-16, 23
 Kaiser William II, xiv, 2-3, 77
 Kallio, 203-4
 Kamenev, 182-4, 192
 Kaphandaris, 141
 Kapp, 7, 23
 Karelia, 205
 Karolyi, 48, 51-2
 Kellogg Pact, 278, 313-14
 Kemal, Mustapha (Ataturk), 212-18
 Kerrl, 34
 Kiao-Chow, xv, 239, 244-5
 Kiel, 1
 Kiev, 159-60
 Kirov, 184
 Koltchak, 169
 Kondylis, 143-4
 Korea, 253-6
 Korfanty, 13, 160
 Kovno, 198
 Krasnoyarsk, 169
 Kreuger, 210
 Kronstadt, 170

Ku Klux Klan, 274
 Kulaks, 177
 Kun, Bela, 48-9, 55
 Kuo Min Tang, 240-3, 247-8
 Kurds, 216-17
 Küstrin, 15
 Kutaia, 138
 Kwang Chow, 249
 Kwang Yang, 243

Lagunja, 130
 Landon, Governor, 290
 Lapuans, 203-4
 Laska, 201
 Lattakia, 220
 Latvia, 197, 200
 Lausanne Agreement (1932), 12, 21, 33
 Lausanne Treaty (Turkey, 1923), 139, 213
 Laval, 66, 73, 107
 Lawrence of Arabia, 225
 League of Nations, xv, 316-34
 Lebrun, 62
 Leguia, 313
 Leipzig Court, 14
 Lenin, 168, 176, 181, 190
 Leopold III of Belgium, 76
 Lefèvre, 117, 119
 Lester, 37
 Leticia, 314-15, 328
 Levinson, Salmon, 278
 Lewis, John, 292
 Leygues, 61
 Liaptcheff, 149-50
 Liberators (Estonia), 201
 Liberia, 326, 331
 Liebknecht, 3-6
 Liechtenstein, 82
 Lindbergh, 275
 Lithuania, 197-200
 Little Entente, 58
 Littoria, 98
 Litvinov, 195, 322
 Liu Kow Chow, 248
 Li Yuan Hung, 239
 Lloyd, Lord, 261
 Lloyd George, 9, 139
 Locarno Treaties, 12-16, 32
 Lombard factories, 88-9
 Long, Huey, 289
 Luang, Pradit, 236

Ludendorff, 1, 16, 23
 Luis, Washington, 304
 Lupescu, Madame, 155
 Lüther, Dr, 16
 Luxembourg, Grand Duchy, 77-8
 Luxembourg, Rosa, 4-5
 Lvov, Prince, 169
 Lyautey, 264-6
 Lytton Commission, 246-7, 328

Maan, 224
 Macdonald, Ramsay, 323
 Macedonians, 149
 Machado (Cuba), 280, 301
 Machado (Portugal), 124
 Madeira, 126
 Madrid, 120-2
 Magyars (see Hungary)
 Makur, 235
 Malinoff, 150
 Manchu Kuo, 246-7
 Manchuria, 245-7, 254-6, 327-8
 Mandates, xv
 Maniu, 154, 156
 Manolescu, 155
 Mariannes, xv
 Marienwerder, xiii, 13, 160
 Marinkovitch, 133
 Maronites, 219
 Marshall Isles, xv
 Marx, William, 16-17
 Masaryk, 55-7
 Matchek, 132-4
 Matignon Agreement, 68
 Matteotti, 93-5
 Maura, 123 :
 Maurras, 64, 68
 Memel, 198
 Mendub, 266
 Mensheviks, 167
 Mequinez, 265
 Mesopotamia (see Iraq)
 Metaxas, 144
 Metro-Vickers, 184, 194
 Mexico, 294-301
 Michael of Rumania, 155
 Mihailoff, 149-50
 Millerand, 61
 Millspaugh, 232-3
 Milner, Lord, 258
 Minobe, Dr, 256
 Murdite Republic, 136

Mohammed VI of Turkey, 214
 Mohammerah, 232
 Mongolia, 243, 248-9
 Monkey Trial, 276
 Monroe Doctrine, 269, 278, 300
 Montenegro, 128-9
 Moraczewski, 158
 Morocco, 114, 264-6
 Moscicki, 163, 166
 Mosul, 228-9
 Mowinckel, 209
 Müller, Hermann, 8, 17, 19
 Müller, Ludwig, 28, 33
 Munich, 23
 Mushanoff, 150
 Mussert, 78
 Mussolini, 89-110

Nadir Khan, 235
 Nagata, 255
 Nahas Pasha, 262-3
 Nanking, 241, 245, 250
 Nansen, 180
 Narutowicz, 162
 Nashashibi, 223
 Nasrullah, 234
 Nauru, xv
 Naval Treaties, 324-5
 Nazis, 18, 20-37
 Negrin, 121
 Nejd, 226
 N.E.P., 181
 Netherlands, 77-80
 Neuilly Treaty, x
 New Deal, 287-94
 Nicaragua, 281, 301, 330
 Nicole, 83
 N.I.R.A., 286-90
 Nitti, 85
 Nombela Affair, 118
 Non-Intervention Conference, 109, 122
 Norway, 207-9
 Noske, 5
 Numerus Clausus, 49
 Nuremberg Conference, 35
 Nuremberg Laws, 35
 Nygaardsvold, 208
 Nyon Conference, 123

Obleute, 3
 Obregon, 295-8

Ogaden, 105, 107
 OGPU, 184-5
 Okada, 255
 Okuniev, 159
 Omar el Mukhtar, 104
 Opium Conventions, 331-2
 Opponitz, 40
 Orlando, 85, 94
 Orleans, Duke of, 64
 Ortez, 309
 Oslo, 209
 Oslo Pact, 79, 211
 Ossietzky, 36
 Otto of Habsburg, 47-55
 Oviedo, 118, 120

Pabst, 40-1
 Paderewski, 158-60
 Paes, 124
 Painlevé, 64
 Palestine, 220-4
 Panama, 280, 293, 301
 Pan-American Conference, 281-2, 308, 312
 Pangalos, 141-2
 Papanastasiou, 141
 Papen, 20-1
 Papua, xv
 Paraguay, 305-6
 Paris Congress, x
 Paul, of Jugoslavia, 134
 Paul, Prince, of Greece, 140
 Paul, Dr, 232
 Paul-Boncour, 65
 Peel Commission, 224
 Pehrsson, 210
 Peiping, 241
 Peking, 241, 248
 Perkonkrust, 200
 Pershing, 310-11
 Persia, 231
 Peru, 313-14
 Peter I of Jugoslavia, 131
 Peter II of Jugoslavia, 134
 Petlura, 169-71
 Pfrimer, 41
 Philippines, 282-3, 293
 Pilsudski, 158-66
 Pius XI, Pope, 95, 97
 Plastiras, 143
 Plumer, xii
 Poincaré, 9-11, 61-2, 64-5

Poland, 158-66
 Polish Corridor, xiii, 32, 165
 Popular Front (France), 67-9, 73
 Popular Front (Spain), 118-23
 Port Arthur, 245
 Portela-Valladares, 119, 123
 Portugal, 124-7
 Portuguese Colonies, 126
 Prajadhipok, of Siam, 236
 Primo de Rivera, José, 119
 Primo de Rivera, Michael, 113-15
 Protogeroff, 149
 Pu-Yi, 246

Quiroga, 110
 Quisling, 208

Raditch Brothers, 130-1
 Raisuli, 265-6
 Rapallo Treaty (Germany), 181
 Rapallo Treaty (Yugoslavia), 85, 129
 Ratchitch, 131
 Rathenau, 17
 Reading, Lord, 222
 Reichsbanner, 18
 Reichsmark, 16
 Reichstag Fire, 25
 Reichswehr, 18, 21, 28
 Renner, 39
 Rentenmark, 16
 Resht, 231
 Rexists, 75-6
 Rhenish Republic, 10
 Rhineland, xii, 32
 Rhodes, 145
 Riffs, 114, 264-6
 Riga Treaty, 160, 170
 Rio del Oro, 117
 Riza Khan, 232-4
 Rodosto, 139
 Rodriguez, 300
 Röhm, 24, 28
 Roosevelt, Franklin, 284-94
 Rothermere, Lord, 54
 Roumania (*see* Rumania)
 Ruanda-Urundi, 77
 Rubio, 299-300
 Ruhr, 10-11, 15, 62-3
 Rumania, 151-7
 Russia, 167-96
 Rutenberg Concession, 222

Ruthenes, 55-6, 160
 Rydz-Smigly, 166
 Rykov, 184, 192

S.A., 22
 Saar, xiii, 31-2
 Sacco and Vanzetti, 277
 St Germain Treaty, x
 Saito, 254-5
 Sakaria, River, 139
 Sakhalin, 252
 Salazar, 125-7
 Salengro, 68
 Salter, Sir Arthur, 251
 Salvador, 301
 Samoa, xv
 Sandler, 209-10
 San Domingo, 280
 Sanjurjo, 117, 120
 San Sebastian, 120
 Santander, 121
 Sarail, 219
 Sarraut, 65
 Saseno, 135
 Saud, Ibn, 225-7
 Saudi Arabia, 226
 Savoy Customs-Zone, 82
 Saxony, 15-16
 Schacht, 19
 Scheidemann, 6
 Scheldt, 78
 Schill, 52
 Schleicher, 21-2, 25, 28
 Schleswig, xiv, 13, 18, 205
 Schuschnigg, 44-7
 Schützbund, 40-3
 Seaman's Charter, 333
 Scipel, 39
 Semenov, 171
 Semussi, 104
 Serbia, 128-9
 Seven Provinces Mutiny, 80
 Sèvres Treaty, x, 212-13
 Shanghai, 245, 247-8, 250
 Sheshuan, 266
 Shire, 107
 Shukri Bey, 214
 Siam, 236
 Siberia, 171
 Sidky Pasha, 262-3
 Sidqi, Bekr, 230
 Silesia, 13, 160

Silva, 125
 Singapore, 331
 Sin Kiang, 244
 Skina, Colonel, 138
 Slavek, 163
 Slavery Conventions, 332
 Slovaks, 55-6
 Slovenes, 128-33
 Smigly-Rydz, 166
 Smyrna, 137-40
 Sokols, 132
 Sonnino, 85
 Sopron, 38
 Sotelo, 120
 Spaho, 134
 Spain, 110-23
 Spartacists, 3-5
 Speier, 10
 Spitzbergen, 207
 S.S., 22
 Stack, Sir Lee, 260
 Stahlhelm, 18, 21, 26
 Stalin, 176, 182-96
 Stamboliski, 147-8
 Starhemberg, 41, 44
 Stavisky, 65-6
 Stickling, 184-5
 Stoyadinovitch, 134
 Straits Convention, 214, 217
 Strasser, 25
 Strauss Affair, 118
 Stresemann, 11, 14-17
 Sturmer, 34
 Sturzo, Don, 93
 Su Chow, 241
 Sudan, 259-63
 Suez Canal, 259-63
 Sun Yat-Sen, 236-7, 239-40
 Suvalki, 161
 Sweden, 209-11
 Switzerland, 81-4
 Syria, 218-20
 Szegedin, 48
 Tacna-Arica, 310-11
 Tadzhikistan, 173
 Tangier, 264-6
 Tanner, 203
 Tannou-Touva, 249
 Tardieu, 71
 Tatarescu, 156
 Tcheka, 182, 185
 Teapot Dome, 275
 Tel Aviv, 222
 Tellini, 146
 Terauchi, 255
 Teschen, 55, 58
 Thälmann, 17, 25
 Theunis, 75
 Thrace, 137-9, 212-13
 Thuringia, 4, 15-16, 24
 Thyssen, 23
 Timurtash Khan, 233
 Tirana Treaty, 137
 Tittoni, 85
 Togoland, xv
 Tokio earthquake, 254
 Toledo, 120
 Tomsky, 184, 192
 Townsend, Dr, 288
 Transcaucasia, 173
 Transjordania, 224
 Transylvania, 152, 155
 Trentino, 46, 84
 Trianon Treaty, x
 Trieste, 84
 Tripolitania, 104
 Trondhjem, 209
 Trotsky, 168, 181-2, 188
 Tsaldaris, 143
 Tsankoff, 148
 Tsao Kun, 239
 Tsaritsin, 170
 Tsi Ning, 241
 Tsun Yi, 243
 Tuan Chi-Jui, 239
 Tuchuns, 240
 Tuka, Dr, 56
 Turkey, 212-18
 Turkmenistan, 173
 Ukrainians, 164, 169, 171-3, 181, 186
 Ulmanis, 200
 Unilever Trust, 209
 United States of America, 267-94
 Uri Canton, 84
 Uriburu, 307
 Uruguay, 306
 U.S.S.R., 173-96
 Uzbekistan, 173
 Vaitoianu, 153
 Valdemaras, 199

Valencia, 120-1
Valona, 135
Van Zeeland, 75-6
Vargas, 304-5
Vehm Murders, 18
Veltcheff, 150
Venezuela, 302-3
Venizelos, 139-44
Verkhne-Udinsk, 171
Versailles Treaty, ix, 2, 7
Victor Emmanuel of Italy, 91, 108
Vienna, 38, 40-3
Villa, 295-6
Vilna, 161, 198-9, 325-6
Vladivostok, 171, 252
Volkoff, 149
Volstead Act, 272-4

Wafd, 258-64
Wahabis, 226
Wailing Wall, 223
Walloons, 74-6
Wal-Wal, 104-5, 329
Wan Hsien, 250
War criminals, 13-14
War guilt, xiv
Washington Labour Conference, 333
Washington Treaties, 245, 279
Wauchope, Sir Arthur, 223
Wei Hai Wei, 249
Weimar Constitution, 6-7

Weizmann, 221
Weygand, 159
White Russia, 170, 173
Wilson, President, xi-xv, 3, 61, 129, 135, 158, 258, 268-70, 310, 316
Wirth, 14
Witos, 162
Woiciechowski, 162
Wood, General, 282
Wrangel, 170
Wu Pei-Fu, 239-41

Yoshihito of Japan, 253
Young, Hilton, 162
Young Plan, 12, 14, 17, 64
Yudenitch, 170

Zaghoul Pasha, 258-61
Zahir Khan, 235
Zahle, 205
Zaimus, 140, 142-3
Zara, 85
Zeligowski, 161
Zhivkovitch, 132-3
Zinoviev, 182-4, 192
Zionists, 220-1
Zita, Empress, 47, 49
Zogu, Ahmed, 136-7
Zürich, 83
Zveno, 150-1

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



125 554

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

